This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Slav 4354.2.793

Harvard College Library

FROM

Prof. Leo Wiener.

Price Twenty-Five Cents

Church and State

AND OTHER ESSAYS

INCLUDING

ney—Man and Woman: Their Respe Functions—The Mother—A Second Supplement to the Kreutzer Sonata.

BY

COUNT LEO TOLSTOÏ

BOSTON, MASS.
BENJ. R. TUCKER, PUBLISHER
1891

INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE
A. WASSERMAN,
29 CLINTON ST. NEW YORK

CHURCH AND STATE

AND OTHER ESSAYS

INCLUDING

MONEY; MAN AND WOMAN: THEIR RESPECTIVE FUNCTIONS; THE MOTHER; A SECOND SUPPLEMENT TO THE KREUTZER SONATA

BY

COUNT LEO TOLSTOÏ

BOSTON, MASS.
BENJ. R. TUCKER, PUBLISHER
1891

Slav 4354.2.793

HARVARD COLLEGE
APR 14 1904
LIBRARY.

Prof. Leo Wiener

COPYRIGHT,
BY BENJ. R. TUCKER,
1891.

1.9.34

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHURCH AND STATE	5
MONEY	33
MAN AND WOMAN: THEIR RESPECTIVE FUNCTIONS .	137
THE MOTHER	147
A SECOND SUPPLEMENT TO THE KREUTZER SONATA .	159

CHURCH AND STATE.

TRANSLATED BY VICTOR YARROS.

CHURCH AND STATE.

FAITH is that which invests life with meaning, that which gives strength and direction to life.

Every living man discovers this meaning and lives upon it.

Having failed to discover it, he dies.

In his search, man avails himself of all that humanity has achieved. All that has been achieved by humanity is called revelation.

Revelation is that which helps man to comprehend the meaning of life.

Such is the relation of man to faith.

What a wonderful thing, then! Men appear, who toil unceasingly to make other people enjoy just this and no other form of revelation; who cannot rest until others accept their, just their form of revelation, and who damn, execute, kill, as many as they can of the dissenters. Others

do the same: damn, execute, and kill as many as possible of the dissenters; still others also do the same. And thus, all damn, execute, kill, one another, demanding that all shall believe as they do. And the result is that there are hundreds of faiths, and that all damn, execute, and kill one another.

At first it was amazing to me how such an evident absurdity, such an evident contradiction, failed to destroy faith itself.

How could there remain people who believed in this delusion?

And indeed, from a general point of view, this is inconceivable, and irresistibly proves that every faith is a lie, and that the whole thing is superstition, — which is what the reigning philosophy does prove.

Looking from the general point of view, I too had irresistibly been driven to the admission that all faiths are human delusions; but I could not fail to pause at the reflection that the very silliness of the delusion, its manifestness, and the fact that nevertheless humanity submits to it, — that this very thing proves that at the

foundation of this delusion rests something that is not a delusion.

Otherwise, it were all so foolish that people could not deceive themselves.

The very submission of entire humanity, which truly lives, to the delusion, obliged me to acknowledge the significance of that phenomenon which is the cause of the delusion; and upon this conviction I began to analyze the Christian doctrine, which serves as the foundation of the delusion of entire Christian humanity.

So it appears from the general point of view; but from the personal point of view, from that inconsequence of which every man (and I), in order to live, must have faith in the meaning of life, and has such faith, — this fact of compulsion in the matter of faith is still more amazing in its absurdity.

Really, how, why, to whom, can it be necessary that another should not only believe, but profess, in the same way that I do?

A man lives, consequently he knows the meaning of life. He has fixed his relation to

God; he knows the truth of truths, and I know the truth of truths.

The forms of these may be different.

The substance must be one and the same, — we are both men.

How, why, what may compel me to demand from anybody that he shall manifest his truth absolutely as I do?

Compel him to change his faith I cannot; either by violence, cunning, or deception. (False miracles.)

Faith in his life, — how then can I take away his faith and give him another? It is like taking his heart out and putting another in.

I can do it only if faith, his as well as mine, is — words, and not that whereby he lives; if our faith is an excrescence, not the heart.

Another reason why this cannot be done is that it is impossible to force a man to believe that which he does not believe, — that is, to fill his relation to God, — and because he who knows that faith is the relation of man to God cannot wish to determine the relations of another man to God through force or fraud.

This is impossible, but it is done and has been done everywhere and always; that is, it could not be done, since it is impossible, but something is being done and has been done that is very much like it. What is being done and has been done is the imposing by some on others the likeness of faith, and the acceptance of this likeness of faith by the others, — likeness of faith, — that is, the delusion of faith.

Faith cannot impose itself, and cannot be adopted for the sake of anything, — violence, deception, or utility; and hence it is not faith, but the delusion of faith.

And this delusion of faith is the ancient condition of the life of humanity.

In what, then, does this delusion consist, and on what is it founded?

What produces it in the deceivers, and what sustains it in the deceived?

I will not speak about Brahminism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, in which the same phenomena have taken place; not, however, because the same would not be found to be the case. To every one who has read about those

religions it will be clear that with those faiths it is the same as with Christianity. I will speak exclusively about Christianity, as a faith familiar to us, needful and dear to us.

In Christianity the whole delusion is built on the fanatical idea of Church, based on nothing, and astounding, at the commencement of the study of Christianity, in its unexpected and useless absurdity.

Of all the godless ideas and terms, there is no term and concept more godless than the idea of Church.

There is no idea that has produced more evil, no idea more hostile to the doctrine of Christ, than the idea of Church.

At bottom, the word *Ecclesia* means *collection* and nothing more, and so it is used in the Gospels.

In the languages of all new peoples the word *Ecclesia* signifies house of worship.

Further than these significations, in spite of the fifteen centuries' existence of the delusion of Church, this word has not advanced in any language.

According to the definitions given to this word by those priests who need this delusion of Church, it is nothing else than an introduction to this effect:

"Everything I am about to say is truth, and, if you will not believe, I shall burn you, or damn you, and in every way work you injury."

This idea is a sophism, necessary for certain dialectical purposes, and it remains the inheritance of those who need it.

Among the people, and not only among the people, but in society, and among educated men, in spite of the fact that the Catechism teaches it, this idea does not exist.

This definition (however ashamed one may be to analyze it seriously, it has to be done, seeing that so many people put it forward as something important) is totally false.

When it is said that the Church is the congregation of the truly-faithful, nothing is really said; since, if I say that a chapel is the congregation of all true musicians, I say nothing if I do not declare whom I call true musicians.

While, according to theology, the truly-faithful are those who follow the doctrine of the Church, — that is, are in the Church.

To say nothing of the circumstance that of such true faiths there are hundreds, the definition tells us nothing, and would even seem useless, did not the trace of a certain ear-mark become perceptible here.

The Church is true and one, and in her are the pastors and papacies; and the pastors, appointed by God, teach this true and unitary doctrine, — that is,

"By God, Everything We are Going to Say, everything is genuine truth."

And nothing more!

The whole delusion is here, in the word and in the idea, Church. And the delusion only signifies that there are people who have an immoderate desire to teach their faith to others.

But for what end do they wish so strongly to teach others their faith?

Did they possess genuine faith, they would know that in faith is the meaning of life, the relation to God, fixed by every man individu-

ally, and that it is therefore impossible to *teach* faith, but only the *delusion* of faith.

But they *desire* to teach.

To what end?

The simplest answer would be that the Pope needs cakes and eggs, the bishops a castle, fish-pie, and a silken cassock. But this answer is insufficient.

Such, no doubt, is the inward, psychological motive of the delusion, the motive maintaining it; but, reasoning thus, how could one man (executioner) venture to kill another against whom he has no malice?

It would be inadequate to say that the executioner kills because he is not given brandy, a loaf of white bread, and a red shirt; just in the same degree would it be inadequate to say that the Metropolitan of Kieff and the monks fill sacks with straw which they call saints' relics, just for the sake of getting an income of thirty thousand.

Both acts, the one and the other, are too terrible and repugnant to human nature to allow such an explanation to be adequate.

As the executioner, so the Metropolitan, in explaining his act, will cite a whole series of proofs, the chief basis of which will be historical tradition.

"It is necessary to execute men; since the world came into existence there have been executions. If not I, then somebody else. I will do it, I hope, with the aid of God, better than another," will say the executioner.

"Formal worship is necessary; since the world came into existence, the relics of the saints have been honored," will say the Metropolitan; "the relics of the caves are honored; people come here. If not I, then somebody else will play the host here. And I, with the aid of God, hope to dispose of the money, got by blasphemous fraud, in a way more pleasing to God."

To understand the delusion of faith, it is necessary to go to its source, to the origin.

We speak of that which we know in reference to Christianity.

Turning to the original Christian doctrine in the Gospels, we find a doctrine directly excluding formal worship, censuring it, and one that

with particular plainness and positiveness denies all teaching.

But since Christ's time, and down to ours, we find a deviation of doctrine from the foundations laid by Christ.

This deviation begins at the time of the apostles, especially with that lover of teaching, Paul; and the wider Christianity extends, the more it deviates and appropriates the methods of that very external worship and dogmatism, the denial of which was so positively expressed by Christ.

But in the first days of Christianity the idea of *Church* is used only as a representation of all those who share the faith which I consider the true one.

A wholly true idea, provided it does not include mere verbal manifestations of beliefs (but expressions by means of the entire life), since beliefs cannot be manifested by words.

The conception of the true Church was also used as an argument against the opponents; but until Emperor Constantine and the Nicæan Council, *Church* was only an idea.

But since Constantine and the Nicæan Council the Church has been a thing, and a thing of fraud.

The fraud begins with the Metropolitan and the relics, the priests and the Lord's Supper, Synods, and the like, which so astound and horrify us, and which, from their ugliness, do not find an adequate explanation in the mere advantage derived by those persons.

The delusion is old, and did not proceed from the mere advantages to private persons: there lives no such man, monster, who would determine to do it if he were the first and if there were no other causes.

The causes that led to it were bad ones.

"By their fruits shall you know them."

The source was evil: hate, human pride, hostility toward Arius and others, and another still graver evil, — the union of Christianity with power.

Power: Constantine, emperor, according to heathen ideas one who stands at the height of human grandeur (he was counted among the gods), accepts Christianity, furnishes an ex-

ample to the whole nation, converts the nation, and extends a helping hand as against heretics, and through the ecumenical council fixes the unitary orthodox Christian faith.

The Christian Catholic faith is fixed forever.

So natural was it to yield to that delusion that even unto this day men believe in the salutariness of that event. While the event was really such that, thanks to it, the majority of Christians have repudiated their faith. That was the point where the overwhelming majority of Christians took the heathen road, which is still followed.

Charles the Great, Vladimir, continue the same work.

And the delusion has continued up to our time, the delusion being right here, — for the acceptance of power by Christianity is needful for those who understand the letter, but not the spirit, of Christianity.

In reality, the acceptance of Christianity without the repudiation of power is a mockery and perversion of Christianity.

The consecration of governmental power by

Christianity is blasphemy, is the doom of Christianity.

Having lived fifteen hundred years under this blasphemous union of pretended Christianity with Government, it is necessary to make a great effort in order to forget those intricate sophisms which for fifteen centuries, everywhere, at power's pleasure, have perverted the doctrine of Christ, to make it compatible with Government, and the attempts to explain the sacredness, legitimacy of Government, and the possibility of its being Christian.

At bottom, the words, "Christian Government" are like the words, "warm, hot ice."

Either there is no Government, or there is no Christianity.

To understand this clearly, it is necessary to forget all those phantasies in which we are carefully educated, and plainly inquire into the import of those sciences, historical and judicial, which we are taught.

These sciences are without any foundations; all these sciences are nothing else than an apology for violence.

Passing by the history of the Medes and Persians, etc., let us take that Government which first made a union with Christianity.

There was a cut-throats' nest in Rome. It spread by robbery, violence, murder. It conquered nations. The robbers and their descendants, with chiefs (who were called, now Cæsar, now Augustus) at their head, plundered and tortured the people to gratify their desires. One of the descendants of these cut-throats, Constantine, having read a great deal in books and having become satiate with his voluptuous living, preferred certain dogmas of Christianity to previous beliefs; to the bringing of human sacrifices, he preferred grand mass; to the worship of Apollo and Venus and Jupiter, he preferred the one God, with his Son Christ; and he ordered the introduction of this faith among those who were under his authority.

"Kings rule over their peoples; this shall not be among you. — Do not kill. — Do not commit adultery. — Abjure riches. — Do not judge; do not condemn. — Endure evil."

All this nobody told him of.

"Oh, you wish to call yourself a Christian and continue to be the chief of the cut-throats, — to assault, burn, fight, do mischief, execute, and revel? All right!"

And they furnished him a Christianity, and made it very comfortable, — better than could have been expected.

They anticipated that he might, on reading the Gospel, bethink himself that there more is demanded of him than the building of churches and the visiting them, that a Christian life is there required; and they thoughtfully and with foresight constructed such a Christianity for him that he could without embarrassment live in the old, heathen way.

On the one hand, Christ, the Son of God, appeared for no other purpose than to redeem him, Constantine, and all the others. Because Christ died, Constantine can live as he pleases.

And if this is not enough, one may repent and swallow a piece of bread with some wine; — in this there will be salvation and all will be forgiven. And not satisfied with this, they even consecrated his ruffianly power, and said that he was from God; and anointed him with oil.

For this he, too, arranged for them as they desired. He called a council of priests, had them declare what the relation of every man should be to God and every other man, and the same he ordered to be repeated.

And all were satisfied; and thus for a thousand years has this faith lived in the world, and other cut-throat chiefs have introduced it, and they are all anointed, and everything, everything, is from God.

If some villain plunders everybody, massacres many people, he will be anointed by them, — he is from God.

Some nations have had husband-slayers and libertines.

The French have had Napoleon.

And the priests, in compensation for this, not only are from God, but almost are themselves gods, since in them resides the Holy Ghost. He resides in the priests as well as in the Synod, with its commanders, the officials.

And as soon as a certain anointed — that is, a cut-throat chief — becomes possessed of the desire to massacre another as well as his peo-

ple, holy water is at once made for him, some of it is sprinkled, the cross is taken up (that very cross carrying which Christ died, because he repudiated these very cut-throats), and a blessing is bestowed on massacre, hangings, and beheadings.

And everything would be well; but even here they could not agree among themselves, and the anointed proceeded to call each other cut-throats (that which they really are), while the people began to listen and ceased to believe either the anointed or the keepers of the Holy Ghost, but learned from their own lips to call them by their real names, as they themselves call each other, — namely, cut-throats and impostors.

But to the cut-throats we have only referred *à propos*, since they had traduced the impostors.

Our talk is properly about the impostors, the pretended Christians.

Such they have become in consequence of the union with the cut-throats.

And it could not be otherwise. They deviated from the path at the first minute that they con-

secrated the first Emperor, and assured him that he could help the faith with his violence, — the faith of humility, self-denial, and the endurance of injury.

The whole history of the actual Church, — not the fantastic, — that is, the history of the hierarchy under the authority of the emperors, is a series of vain attempts on the part of this unfortunate hierarchy to preserve the truth of the doctrine, while propagating it by means of lies and abjuring it in practice.

The importance of the hierarchy is based only on the doctrine which it intends to teach.

The doctrine speaks about humility, self-abnegation, love, destitution; but the doctrine is propagated by violence, hatred, and evil.

That the hierarchy may have something to teach, that there may be disciples, it is needful not to forsake the doctrine; while in order to whitewash itself and its illegitimate union with power, it is necessary to disguise by the shrewdest considerations the substance of the doctrine and to transfer for the purpose its centre of gravity, from the substance of the doctrine to its formal side.

And this is what the hierarchy is doing, — this is the source of that delusion of faith propagated by the Church.

The source is the union of the hierarchy with violence under the respective names of Church and power.

As to the source of people's desire to teach their faith to others, it is found in the fact that faith unmasks them, and they are obliged to substitute, in place of genuine faith, one of their own invention, to be justified by it.

Genuine faith may exist everywhere except where it is obviously false, — that is, addicted to violence.

Everywhere, but not in Government-imposed faith.

Genuine faith may exist in all so-called schisms, heresies, but certainly cannot exist only where it is united with Government.

Strange to say, but the appellations, orthodox, Catholic, Protestant faith, as these words are fixed in common speech, signify nothing else than faith united with power, Government faith, and hence false.

The conception of Church, — that is, unanimity of many, of the majority, and at the same time the proximity to the source during the first two centuries of Christianity, — was but one of the weak formal arguments.

Paul said:

"I know from Christ himself."

Another said:

"I know from Luke."

And all said:

"We think rightly, and the proof of this is that there is a large congregation of us, *Ecclesia*, Church."

But only after the Nicæan Council, arranged by the Emperor, did the direct and conscious delusion begin for a part of those who professed the same faith.

"It pleases us and the Holy Ghost," they began to say then.

The conception of Church became not merely a poor argument, but also, for some, a power.

The Church united with power, and began to act as a power.

And everything that united itself with power

and yielded to it ceased to be faith, and became delusion.

What does Christianity teach, whether understood as the doctrine of a given church, or of all churches?

Analyze it as you like, shift or subdivide, the Christian doctrine will at once separate itself into two sharp parts:

1. The doctrine of dogmas, beginning with God's Son, Holy Ghost, and the relation between these personalities, down to the Lord's Supper, with or without wine, with fresh or sour bread.

2. And the moral doctrine, — humility, indifference to wealth, bodily and spiritual purity, charity, emancipation from slavery, bonds, and worldliness.

Notwithstanding all the efforts of the Church to blend these two phases of the doctrine, they never intermixed, and, like oil and water, have always kept apart from each other in large or small drops.

The difference between these two sides of the doctrine is clear to every one, and every one

may trace the fruits of one and the other side of the doctrine in the lives of nations, and from these fruits may conclude which side is the more important; or, if one may say truer, then which one is the truer?

Glance at the history of Christianity from this side, and a terror will come upon you.

Without exception, from the very beginning to the very end, to our time, wherever you will look, whatever dogma you will glance at, even at the first, — the dogma of the divinity of Christ, — and down to the communion, with or without wine, the fruits of all these intellectual labors upon the elucidation of dogmas are: malice, hatred, executions, expulsions, the massacres of wives and children, stakes, and tortures.

Look at the other side, — the moral doctrine: from the retiring to the desert for communion with God, down to the custom to carry loaves of bread to the prison, the fruits of this doctrine are all our ideas of good, all our joy, consolation, and light.

Those men before whose eyes the fruits of the one and the other have not yet clearly mani-

fested themselves could fall into error, could only fall into error. Those, too, could fall into error who were sincerely carried away by the disputes about dogmas, not perceiving that they, by these dogmas, served the devil, not God, not noting that Christ explicitly said that he had come to destroy all dogmas.

Those, too, could fall into error who, having inherited the traditions about the importance of those dogmas, received such a wrong mental training that they cannot see their mistake.

Those, too, may err who are ignorant and to whom these dogmas represent nothing but words and fantastic images.

But we, to whom is open the original meaning of the Gospels, which denies all dogmas; we who have before our eyes the fruits of these dogmas in history, we may not err. History is for us the test of the truth of the doctrine, a test almost mechanical.

The dogma of immaculate conception, is it needful or not?

What has resulted from it?

Wickedness, abuse, derision.

Was there any benefit?

None.

The doctrine that the adulteress is not to be condemned, is it needful or not?

What has resulted from it?

Thousands and thousands of times have men been mollified by this reminder.

Another consideration. Take any dogma whatever, are all agreed upon it?

No.

And about giving to him who begs?

All.

Thus, the first, the dogmas, on which there is no agreement, which nobody needs, which ruins men, — this the hierarchy has advanced and is advancing as the faith; while the second, that on which all are agreed, which all need, and which saves men, — this, though the hierarchy has not dared to deny it, it also has not dared to advance as *the doctrine*, for this doctrine denies the hierarchy itself.

MONEY.

Translated by Victor Yarros.

MONEY.

MONEY! What is money? Money represents labor.

I have met people who even held that money represents the labor of him who possesses it.

I confess that formerly I vaguely shared this opinion. But it was essential for me to learn fully what money is. And in order to learn this, I turned to science.

Science says that money is not at all unjust or pernicious; that money is the natural condition of social life, indispensable:

1. To facility of exchange;
2. To determination of measures of value;
3. To purposes of saving; and
4. To make payments.

The potent fact that I, having three roubles in my pocket which I do not want, only need to whistle in order to gather around me, in

every civilized city, a hundred men, ready, for the three roubles, to perform the hardest and most disgusting jobs, — this fact, it is alleged, is not due to money, but to highly complex conditions of the economic life of nations.

The rule of some people over others is not due to money, but to the fact that the laborer does not receive the full value of his labor. And the failure of the laborer to receive this full value is due to the properties of capital, rent, and wages, and the complicated relations between these factors and the processes of production, distribution, and consumption of wealth.

In plain language, it might be said that those who have money can do what they please with those who have none; but science says that this is irrelevant.

Science says:

"In every species of production these factors take part: land, stored-up labor (capital), and labor. And from the different relations between these factors, and from the fact that the first two factors — land and capital — are in the hands, not of the laborers, but of other persons,

with all the complex combinations consequent upon it, results the enslavement of some men by others."

How does that rule of money come about, which astounds us by its injustice and cruelty?

How does it come about that by means of money some people rule over others?

Science says:

It results from the division in the factors of production and the combinations consequent upon it which oppress the laborer.

This answer has always appeared strange to me, not only because it ignores one side of the question, — namely, the *rôle* played by money, — but also on account of that division in the factors of production which, to an unprejudiced man, always appears artificial and non-natural.

It is asserted that in every act of production three factors take part: land, capital, and labor; and it is implied that wealth (or the money equivalent) naturally gets divided among those who possess one or another of the factors.

Rent, the value of the land, belongs to the landlord,

Interest, to the capitalist, and
Wages for labor, to the laborer.
Is it not so?

But is it really true that in any production these factors take part?

As I write these lines, people around me are occupied in producing hay.

What are the elements constituting this production?

I am told: There is the land on which the grass was grown, the capital, — scythes, rakes, hayforks, and the carts for the getting-in of the hay, — and the labor.

But I see that this is not true.

Besides the land, there enter into the production the sun, water, the social organization which protects the meadow from cattle, the skill of the laborers, their facilities of speech and understanding, and yet many other factors which, for some reason, are not taken cognizance of by political economy.

The properties of the sun are just as much a factor as, and more indispensable than, land.

I can imagine people living in a condition where (as in cities) some people consider themselves entitled to shut others out of the sunlight by walls or trees. Why then is not the sun included in the factors of production?

Water is another factor equally indispensable with land. Air, still another. And I can also imagine people deprived of water and pure air, because other people claim the right to dispose at will of the water and air needful to the first.

Social safety is an equally indispensable factor.

Food and clothing for the laborers, another factor, as indeed some economists allow.

Education, which makes it possible to introduce reason into production, is also a factor.

I could fill a volume with such ignored factors.

Why, then, are the above three factors selected and made the basis of science? Why are not the rays of the sun, water, food, education, assigned as factors, while only land, means of production, and labor are assigned?

The only reason I can think of is that but

very seldom do men claim the privilege of appropriating sunlight, water, air, food, etc., while the claims upon land and the means of production are constantly and perpetually made in our society.

There is no other ground; and thus I see that the division of the factors of production into three categories is wholly arbitrary and not in harmony with the essence of things.

But perhaps this division is so natural to men that, wherever economic relations develop, these three factors straightway become prominent?

Let us see if this be so.

First, I look at the nearest case, of the Russian colonists, of whom there are a million.

These colonists arrive at their destination, settle upon the land, and begin to work. It does not enter anybody's head that a man who does not use land can have any rights over it, while the land itself does not make any claim to distinct rights. On the contrary, the colonists deliberately proclaim the land to be common property, and think it just for each to sow and reap as much as, and where, he likes.

The colonists introduce implements for the cultivation of the fields, for planting gardens, and building houses, and again, it does not enter anybody's mind that the instruments of production could of themselves produce any revenue, while capital clamors for no rights. On the contrary, the colonists deliberately conclude that any profit from the use of the implements, from the loan of grain, from capital, is an injustice.

The colonists work, on free land, with their own implements or with such as are loaned to them without interest, every one for himself or all together for the common interest, and in such a commune neither rent, interest, nor wages can be found.

In speaking of such communities, I am not inventing, but describing that which has existed at all times and which exists now, not only among Russian colonists, but everywhere, as long as the natural qualities of men remain unperverted by anything. I am describing that which represents itself to everybody as natural and rational.

Men settle on land, and each member goes about his vocation. Having made the necessary tools, each proceeds with his work. If it appears more convenient to work together, a coöperative organization is formed. But neither in private holdings nor in such organizations will there be distinct factors of production; there will simply be labor and the necessary conditions of labor: the sun, warming all; the air, which all breathe; the water, which all drink; the land, which all till; clothes on the bodies; food in the stomach; a shovel, a plough, a machine by which they work. And it is evident that neither sun, nor air, nor water, nor land, nor clothes, nor plough, can be the property of anybody except those who use these things, who enjoy the sun's rays, breathe the air, drink the water, eat the bread, cover their bodies, and use the shovel or the machine, because these are needful only to those who use them. And when people act thus, we all see that they act as befits men, — that is, rationally.

Thus, when I observe the formation of men's

economic relations, I fail to find that the division of the factors of production into three categories is natural to men. I see, on the contrary, that it is unnatural and irrational.

But perhaps this division is unnatural in primitive societies alone, while upon increase of population and development of the arts and sciences it becomes indispensable? Perhaps it is true that this division has been accomplished in European society, and we cannot refuse to acknowledge the accomplished fact?

Let us see if this is so.

We are told that this division of factors of production is accomplished, — that is, that some men possess the land, others the means of production, while still others are destitute of both land and capital.

The laborer is without land and instruments of production.

We are so accustomed to this assertion that we no longer are struck by its strangeness. If, however, we ponder over this statement, we at once see its injustice and even its absurdity.

In that statement there is an essential contradiction.

The conception of the laborer includes the conception of the land on which he lives and the implements with which he works: if he did not live on land and did not possess instruments of labor, he would not be a laborer. There never has been, and never can be, a laborer without land and instruments of labor. There can be no farmer without land to farm on and without scythe, cart, horse. Likewise there can be no shoemaker without a house built on land, without water, air, and tools to work with.

If the farmer does not possess land, a horse, and a scythe; if the shoemaker has not a house, water, and awl, — then that means that somebody has driven the farmer off of his land, and has taken away from him, by force or fraud, his scythe, cart, and horse; but it in no way signifies that there may be farmers without scythes or shoemakers without tools.

As it is impossible to think of a fisherman on dry land and without fishing implements,

unless we think of him as driven away from the water and robbed of his fishing implements, so it is impossible to think of a peasant without land and tools, unless we imagine that somebody drove him from the land and took away his implements.

There may exist people who are driven from one place to another, who have their implements taken away from them, and who are compelled to make with others' tools things they do not want; but this does not signify that such is the character of production; it means only that there are cases where the natural character of production is perverted. If, however, we are to consider as factors of production all that a laborer might be deprived of by force, then why not consider the claim on the person of the slave a factor of production? Why not count the claims on the sun's rays, on air or water, as factors?

A man may build a wall and shut out his neighbor from sunlight; a man may poison the water of a river by directing it into a pond; and a man may claim another's person

as his property; but neither the first, second, nor third claim, if carried into operation by force, can be acknowledged as a basis for a division of the factors of production. And therefore it is just as wrong to accept the alleged rights to the land and tools as factors of production as it is to accept the alleged rights to the exclusive use of the sun's rays, air, water, and the person of another as distinct factors of production.

There may be people who lay claim to the land and the tools of the laborers, just as there have been people who have claimed rights over the person of the laborer, and as there may be people who claim the right to the exclusive enjoyment of the sun's rays, water, air. There may be people who drive the laborer from place to place, and who rob him of the products of his labor, as fast as they are turned out, and of the instruments of production, and who compel him to work for a master instead of for himself, as is done in the factories; all this is possible. But there can be no laborer without land, just as there can be no property in man, notwith-

standing the fact that for a long time the latter was considered possible.

And as the assertion of the right of property in the person of another cannot deprive the slave of his inherent tendency to seek his own, and not his master's, good, so, in this case, the assertion of the right of property in land and others' instruments of production cannot deprive the laborer of man's inherent tendency to live on land and work with his own or with communal instruments on things which he deems useful for himself.

All that science can say in examining the prevailing economic condition is that there are certain claims made by some men upon the land and tools of the workers, in consequence of which, for a certain portion (but by no means for all) of the workers, the natural conditions of production are violated, so that laborers are deprived of land and tools and driven to work with others' tools. But science cannot say that this accidental violation of the natural law of production is in fact the fundamental law of production.

Affirming that the division of the factors of production is really the fundamental law of production, the economist is doing precisely that which the zoölogist would do if, finding a great number of siskins in cages, with clipped wings, he concluded that the cage, and the little water-bowl moving on rails, are the essential conditions of the existence of the birds, and that the life of the birds depends on the three factors, the cage, the water-bowl, and the clipped wings.

However large the number of siskins in cages and with clipped wings, the zoölogist cannot infer that cages are the natural condition of birds.

However large the number of laborers driven from their place, and lacking the fruits as well as the instruments of their production, the natural condition of the laborer will always be that of living on his land and producing with his own tools that which he wants.

To be sure there are claims made upon the land and tools of the laborer, just as there were in the ancient society; but there can be

no such division of the factors of production into land and capital as the economists wish to fix in modern society.

And these illegitimate claims of some upon the freedom of other people, science calls the natural conditions of production.

Instead of deriving its fundamental propositions from the natural condition of human societies, science has taken them from a special case; and, wishing to justify this special case, it has acknowledged the right of one man to the land which supports another, — that is, it has acknowledged a right which never has existed and which cannot exist, and whose expression contains a contradiction, since the right of a man to land which he does not cultivate is at bottom nothing else than the right to use that which he does not use, while the right to the instruments of production is the right to use instruments which he really does not use.

By its division of the factors of production, science affirms that the natural condition of the laborer is that unnatural condition in which he is now placed, just as in the ancient world

the division of men into citizens and slaves was an affirmation that the unnatural condition of the slaves was the natural condition of some men.

This division, accepted by science for no other end than to justify the existing wrong, which is made the basis of all her investigations, is responsible for the fact that science vainly endeavors to give anything like explanations of existing phenomena, denying the most patent and simple answers to the questions suggested and giving answers that are absolutely empty.

The question of economic science is this:

What is the cause of the fact that some people, in possession of land and capital, can enslave those men who do not possess land and capital?

The answer which occurs to common sense is that this results from money, which possesses the quality of converting people into slaves.

But science denies this and says:

This results, not from the nature of money, but from the fact that some people possess land and capital, while others do not.

We inquire: Why do the men possessing land and capital enslave the disinherited?

The answer is: Because they possess land and capital.

But this is just what our question is about.

Non-possession of land and capital *is* enslavement.

While the answer is no better than, "The remedy is narcotic because it has a narcotic effect."

Life does not cease to parade its important question, and even science is made aware of it and tries to answer it; but it cannot do it while starting from its present basis, and so turns in a vicious circle.

In order to answer the question, science must begin by repudiating the false division of the factors of production, — that is, must cease to look upon the effects of phenomena as in causes, and must seek, first the immediate, and then the remote, causes of those phenomena which constitute the object of its researches.

Science must answer the question, What is the reason that some people are deprived of

land and means of production, while others possess them?

Or: what causes the alienation of land and means of production from those who cultivate the land and use the instruments?

And as soon as science shall put the question in this form, entirely new considerations will offer themselves, which will reverse all the postulates of the exploded science, which turns in the vicious circle of the assertions that the condition of the laborer is miserable because it is miserable.

To plain people it appears beyond doubt that the immediate cause of the enslavement of some men by others is money. But science, denying this, says that money is only a medium of exchange, which has no connection with the enslavement of men.

Let us see if this is really so.

What is the origin of money?

Under what conditions of national existence is money invariably used, and under what conditions do we know nations doing without money?

In Africa, in Australia, there live small nations in ways that were in vogue in ancient times. The tribe lives, engaged in agriculture, horticulture, and cattle-breeding. We learn of it at the threshold of history.

History begins with the invasion of conquerors.

The conquerors always do the same thing,— they take away from the people all that they possibly can,— cattle, grain, textures, even men and women they take away as prisoners.

After a few years the conquerors return, but the people have not had time to recuperate after the ruin, and there is nothing to appropriate; so new methods of exploiting the tribe's powers are thought of.

These methods are very simple, and spontaneously occur to all men.

The first method is personal slavery.

This method is inconvenient, inasmuch as it involves the control of all the working powers of the tribe and the feeding of the whole, and naturally the second method suggests itself,— that of leaving the tribe on its land, which the

conquerors declare their property, and the division of it among certain warriors, who become the agents through whom the labor of the tribe is passed to the conquerors.

But this method, too, has its inconveniences. The warriors are obliged to control the entire production of the tribe, and there is introduced the third method, equally primitive, which consists of the levy of a fixed periodical tribute upon the conquered.

The aim of the conqueror is to appropriate the greatest possible quantity of the products of the conquered.

In order to take the greatest quantity, the conqueror must take the things which are most valuable to the tribe, and which at the same time are not hard to transport and keep, — furs, gold.

So the tribute is usually fixed in furs or gold and collected periodically from the families or the tribe, and by means of this tribute the conquerors enjoy in the most convenient way the fruits of the tribe's labor.

When all the gold and furs are taken away,

the members of the tribe are obliged to sell to each other, to the conqueror, to the warriors, all that they possess: their goods, as well as their labor.

So it was in antiquity, so it was in the Middle Ages, and so it is now.

In antiquity, with its frequent conquests of nations and the absence of human equality, personal slavery was the most wide-spread method of subjugating men.

In the Middle Ages the feudal system, — that is, landed property and the accompanying serfdom, — partially supplants personal slavery, and the centre of gravity of subjugation is transferred from the person to the land.

In modern times, since the discovery of America and the development of commerce, with the overflow of gold made the universal money token, the money-tribute has become, with the strengthening of governmental authority, the chief means of the subjugation of men, and by it are determined all the economic relations of men.

In the "Literary Magazine" Professor Yan-

joul narrates the recent history of the Fiji Islands.

On the South-Sea Islands, in Polynesia, lives the Fiji tribe.

The whole group of islands, says Professor Yanjoul, consists of a large number of small islands occupying an area of about forty thousand English square miles. Only half of the area is inhabited, by about fifteen thousand natives and fifteen hundred whites. The natives have long lived in a more or less civilized state, are superior to the other native tribes of Polynesia, and represent a people capable of development, which they have shown by learning to be, in a short time, good agriculturists and cattle-breeders.

The inhabitants of the islands were prosperous. But in 1858 the kingdom found itself in a desperate condition: the Fiji nation and its king, Kakabo, wanted money.

They needed forty-five thousand dollars to compensate the United States for alleged injuries that had been inflicted by Fijians upon certain citizens of the American republic. To

collect the tax, the Americans sent a squadron, which suddenly seized some of the best islands, as collateral, and threatened to bombard and destroy the settlements if the tax should not be paid to the American representatives at a specified date.

The Americans were among the first colonists that appeared, together with the missionaries, on the Fiji Islands.

Selecting and seizing, under this or that pretext, the best patches of land on the islands, and founding there cotton and coffee plantations, the Americans hired whole bands of natives, binding them by contracts unintelligible to them, or procuring them through dealers in live merchandise.

Conflicts between these master-planters and the natives, who were regarded as slaves, were inevitable. Some of these conflicts it was which served as an excuse for the contribution levied by the Americans.

In spite of the prosperous condition of the islands, the Fijians have preserved the forms of natural economic organization which existed in

Europe during the Middle Ages, down to our own time. There was no money in circulation among the natives, and the entire commerce had the character of barter exclusively; commodities were exchanged for commodities, and the few local and royal taxes were also paid directly in rural products.

What could the Fijians and their king, Kakabo, do when the Americans categorically demanded forty-five thousand dollars under the threat of direst penalties?

This sum alone was something inconceivable to the Fijians, to say nothing about money, which they had never seen in such quantities.

Kakabo took counsel with other chiefs and decided to appeal to the Queen of England to take the islands under her protection; and subsequently went so far as to ask for immediate annexation.

The English proceeded very cautiously in the matter, and did not hasten to relieve the semi-savage monarch from his difficulties.

Instead of a direct answer, the English, in 1860, equipped a special expedition to inspect

the Fiji Islands, with the view to decide whether it was worth while to annex the islands and spend money to satisfy American creditors.

Meanwhile the American Government continued to insist upon being paid, and kept, as security, in practical ownership, some of the best points; and as soon as it had made a careful estimate of the national wealth, it raised the tax to ninety thousand dollars, and threatened to raise it still more if Kakabo delayed payment.

Then Kakabo, pressed from all sides and unfamiliar with European methods of credit transactions, acted upon the suggestions of European colonists and tried to raise money from Melbourne merchants, at any rates and conditions, not hesitating to yield his kingdom to private parties.

At Kakabo's instigation, then, a stock-company was formed at Melbourne. This stock-company, which called itself the "Polynesian Association," formed contracts with the rulers of Fiji, stipulating for itself the most advantageous terms. Undertaking to pay the debt due to the American Government in instalments

at specified times, the Company, in consideration of this, received at first one hundred thousand and then two hundred thousand acres of the best land, chosen by itself, exemption from all taxes and duties, for an unlimited time, for its factories, operations, and colonies, and the exclusive right, for a long period, of maintaining banks of issue, with the privilege of the unlimited issue of notes.

Since this contract, formed finally in 1868, in Fiji, there has sprung up, alongside of the local government with Kakabo at its head, another rule, a powerful commercial organization with immense landed estates on all the islands and decisive influence in the administration.

Up to that time the Kakabo Government had contented itself, for the satisfaction of its needs, with the taxes paid in material products and a low tariff on foreign imports. Since the conclusion of the treaty and the formation of the Polynesian Association, the financial conditions of the government have changed. A considerable part of the best lands having passed into the ownership of the Association, the income

from the taxes diminished. On the other hand, the Association having, as we know, stipulated freedom of exportation and importation of all products, the revenue from the tariff duties also decreased. The natives — that is, ninety-nine per cent of the population — had never paid much in tariff duties, as they had not used any European goods except a few textile products and metallic wares; so, in consequence of the exemption of the wealthiest Europeans from the payment of tariff duties, the revenue of Kakabo became miserably small, and it became necessary for him to arrange for an increase.

Kakabo sought the advice of his white friends as to the best way of remedying the evil, and they suggested the introduction of the first direct tax into the country, and, in all probability, for his convenience, in the form of a money tribute.

The tax was accordingly fixed in the form of an annual payment of one pound sterling for every male and four shillings for every female in the whole group of islands.

As we have already stated, even at present,

the Fijians live under primitive economy and the system of barter. Very few natives have money; their wealth consists entirely of different raw-produce and cattle, not of money.

But the new tax made money a necessity at a certain date, and in an amount not insignificant for the native.

Heretofore the native had borne no individual burdens for the benefit of the government. Excepting personal services, all his taxes had been paid by the village or the Commune to which he belonged and from the common lands, which were the main source of his income.

Hence he had but one way left to him, — apply for money to the white colonists, — that is, go to the dealers and planters who had what he wanted, money.

To the first he had to sell his products at any price, as the tax-collector demanded that the money should be paid at a certain date, and he was even obliged to borrow money on his future products, of which the dealers naturally were not slow to take advantage, charging usurious rates. Or else, he had to go to the planter and sell him his labor-power, that is, turn laborer.

But wages, in consequence, probably, of the simultaneous and large supply of labor, proved very low; not above, according to the report of the present administration, one shilling a week for an adult man, or two pounds and twelve shillings a year. Hence, merely to get money to pay his own tax, to say nothing of his family, the Fijian had to abandon his house, land, and sell himself to the planter at least for six months, often having to go very far, to another island, in search of employment, while he could not pay for his whole family, save by adding other means.

The result of such a state of affairs must be plain to everybody.

From his 150,000 subjects Kakabo could raise only six thousand pounds sterling, and this gave rise to a whole series of coercive measures and a vigorous extortion of taxes, — formerly unknown.

The local administration, formerly conscientious, formed an alliance with the white settlers, who became the complete masters of the country.

For failure to pay taxes the Fijians are tried

and condemned to imprisonment for a term of six months, at least, besides the payment of costs. The prison is represented by the plantation of the first white settler who offers to pay the tax and costs for the prisoner. In this way, the whites obtain an abundance of cheap labor, in any quantity desired.

At first the duration of this forced labor was limited to six months; but subsequently bribed judges easily extended the term to eighteen months, often renewing the sentence at its expiration.

Very speedily, in a few years, the whole aspect of the economic condition of the Fijians was completely changed. Entire districts were impoverished and depopulated.

The entire male population, except the aged and infirm, worked for the white planters to obtain the money needed for the payment of the tax or to satisfy the judgment of the court.

The women in Fiji do hardly any field work, and therefore, in the absence of the men, the households were neglected or utterly abandoned.

In a few years half of the population of Fiji became the slaves of the white colonists.

To improve the condition, the Fijians again turned to England.

A petition was gotten up asking for annexation to England, signed by the most famous chiefs and an immense number of others, and presented to the English consul.

By this time England, thanks to her scientific expeditions, had succeeded, not only in exploring, but in measuring, the islands, and thus she was in a position to estimate duly the natural wealth of this beautiful corner of the globe. In consequence of this, the negotiations this time led to fruitful results, and, in 1874, to the great chagrin of the American planters, England officially assumed authority over the islands, making them part of her colonies.

Kakabo died, and his heirs were granted small pensions.

The government of the island was intrusted to Sir Robinson, the governor of New South Wales.

In the first year of its annexation, Fiji had no independent administration, but was under the authority of Sir Robinson, who was represented by an appointee of his.

In taking control over the islands, England assumed the difficult task of fulfilling the various expectations entertained by the several elements of the islands. The natives of course hoped primarily for the abolition of the hateful poll-tax; as to the white colonists, the American portion looked upon English rule with distrust, while the English portion anticipated from it every blessing, — for instance, the recognition of their sovereignty over the natives, the legalization of their titles to the lands seized from the latter, etc.

The English administration proved itself, however, equal to the task; and its first act was the definitive abolition of the poll-tax which had made slaves of the natives for the advantage of the few colonists.

But Sir Robinson was confronted with a serious problem.

It was essential to abolish the poll-tax, which was the cause of the appeal for annexation; but at the same time, accordimg to the principles of English colonial politics, the colonies must support themselves, — that is, must find

their own means of meeting the expenditures of the administration. Now, with the poll-tax abolished, the total of the revenues from the tariff duties did not exceed six thousand pounds; while the administrative expenses amounted to seventy thousand pounds annually.

Sir Robinson hit upon the idea of establishing a labor tax, — that is, a tax paid in labor upon government works.

But this labor tax did not yield the seventy thousand pounds required for the maintenance of Sir Robinson and his assistants; and the uncertainty lasted until the appointment of a new governor, Gordon, who saw the unwisdom of attempting to collect taxes in money before money was circulated in needful quantities in the islands, and decided to take the produce of the natives, and sell it himself.

This tragic episode in the life of the Fijians is the best and plainest indication of the nature and *rôle* of money.

Here everything has manifested itself: the first fundamental condition of enslavement, — threats, cannons, murder, and seizure of the

land, and the principal means, — money, which supplanted all other means.

That which, in a historical sketch of the economic development of nations which present the complete development of all forms of money-rule, would be necessary through long centuries, we have here concentrated in a period of ten years.

The drama begins with the sending, by the American government, of men-of-war with loaded cannons to the shores of the islands, whose natives it wants to subjugate.

The pretext of this threatened invasion is a money matter; but the beginning of the drama is to be found in this directing of the mouths of cannons against *all* the natives, — women, children, old people, and young men, innocent of any offence. A fact, the like of which we see everywhere in America, in China, in Central Asia.

This is the beginning of the drama, "Your money or your life," repeated in the history of all conquests of all nations.

Forty-five (then ninety) thousand dollars or a massacre.

But the ninety thousand are lacking: they are in the pockets of the Americans.

So the second act of the drama begins: it is a postponement, the substitution for a bloody massacre, terrible and concentrated in a brief interval, of sufferings less perceptible, but more protracted.

And the tribe, with its king, seek the means of saving themselves from massacre by enslaving themselves to money.

They borrow money, and the forms of slavery are thereby fixed for them.

This method at once begins to work like a disciplined army, and in five years all is done; not only have the people lost their possession, the right to use their land, but they have lost their personal liberty, — they are slaves.

The third act commences.

The condition becomes unbearable, and they hear rumors that it is possible to change masters. Of emancipation from the slavery imposed by money there is no longer even a thought. And the tribe calls another master, to whom it subjects itself with a prayer to alleviate its situation.

The English come, see that the possession of the islands will enable them to maintain the numerous idlers among them, and the English government appropriates the island and the inhabitants; but it does not make the inhabitants formal slaves, it does not appropriate the land for distribution among its officials.

These old methods are now needless.

What is needed is merely that a tribute be paid, a tribute sufficiently large to prevent the laboring subjects from emancipating themselves from slavery and to support a large number of idlers.

The natives must pay seventy thousand pounds a year. This is the essential condition under which England consents to deliver the Fijians from their American masters, and at the same time the only condition requisite to insure their complete enslavement.

But it is soon found that, in the state in which they are, the Fijians cannot raise seventy thousand pounds. This is too great a demand. The English modify their terms and agree to take a part of the tax in produce, with the under-

standing that the full tax shall be paid in cash as soon as money is sufficiently abundant in the islands.

England acts, not as the first Company, which may be likened to the first invasion of wild conquerors, who want but to extort as much as possible and leave; England acts like a more prudent enslaver, knowing that it is better not to kill the hen that lays the golden eggs.

England at first loosens the reins, in order subsequently to draw them tight forever; to force the Fijians into that condition of financial slavery in which are all European civilized nations, and from which no prospect of deliverance is discernible.

Money is a harmless means of exchange, but not when on the shores of the country are placed loaded cannons directed against the inhabitants.

As soon as money is extorted under threats of violence, there is inevitably repeated the spectacle which we have witnessed on the Fiji Islands. It is, and has been, repeated everywhere and always; among the ancient tribes

and their princes and among modern nations and their governments.

Men having the power to tyrannize over others will do so through levying such a money tribute from them as will force the coerced to become their slaves; and, moreover, there will always occur what occurred between the English and the Fijians, — namely, the tyrants in their demand for money will rather overstep than stop short of the limit at which payment becomes impossible without the coerced becoming absolute slaves.

They will stop at the limit only if checked by a moral sentiment, and even a moral sentiment will not avail if they are themselves in want. But governments will always overstep the limit, in the first place, because there are no moral sentiments recognized by governments, and, secondly, because, as we know, governments are themselves forever in extreme need of money, which need is created by wars and the necessity of maintaining their accomplices.

All governments are hopelessly in debt, and moreover, they could not, even if they would,

refrain from acting upon the rule expressed by a Russian statesman of the eighteenth century: — "We must shear the moujik, and not let his wool grow."

All governments are burdened with inextinguishable debts, and, as a rule, not to speak of accidental decreases in America and England, the debt grows every year in a terrible progression. In the same way do the budgets grow, — that is, the necessity of warring with other tyrants, and distributing money and land gifts among the subordinate tyrants; and therefore, also, does agricultural rent increase.

Wages do not increase, not, however, in consequence of the working of the law of rent, but because there is the forcibly-collected tax, imposed with the view of taking away everything that can possibly be spared, so as to necessitate the selling of one's labor-power, since the use of this last is precisely the purpose for which the tax is levied in the first instance. While the utilization of this labor is only possible if more money is demanded, on the whole, than the laborers can give without depriving themselves of the means of livelihood.

The increase of wages would remove the possibility of enslavement, and therefore, as long as compulsion exists, wages cannot rise.

And this simple and easily comprehended treatment of some men by others, economists call "the iron law;" while the weapon by which this treatment is achieved they call a Harmless Means of Exchange.

Money, they say, that harmless means of exchange, is indispensable to men in their mutual relations.

Why, then, has there been, and could be, no money, in the proper sense, among nations who had no money taxes to pay to aggressors, while there has always been and will be, as among the Fijians, the Kirgises, the Africans, the Phœnicians, and among peoples free from money taxes generally, direct exchange of goods for goods, or accidental measures of value, like sheep, fur, hides, shells?

Money in the proper sense comes into vogue among people only when they are all forcibly made to pay money. Then only does money become indispensable to each as the means to

secure immunity from violence; then only does money receive a constant exchange value.

And not that which is convenient for exchange receives exchange value, but that which is demanded by government: if the government demands gold, gold will receive the exchange value; if colored stones are demanded, colored stones will have that value.

If this is not true, then why has it always been a government prerogative to issue this medium of exchange?

A people, say the Fijians, have determined upon a new medium of exchange. Well, leave them in peace to exchange in any manner they choose, and do not interfere with their exchanges, you who have the power. But you coin the tokens, prohibiting others from coining similar ones; or else, as in Russia, you print pieces of paper, put upon them the images of czars, add peculiar signatures, and provide severe punishments for counterfeiters; then you distribute them among your assistants, and demand, under the name of taxes and duties, from the laborers, so many of such coins or

papers that the laborer is obliged to sell his labor in order to obtain these coins or papers. And you assure us that this money is necessary as a medium of exchange.

Here are all men free; no one oppresses anybody else or keeps him in subjection; no sooner does money appear in the society than there is an Iron Law, thanks to which rent rises while wages decrease to the minimum.

The fact that half, or more than half, of the Russian peasants sell themselves to landed proprietors and manufacturers, to get means to pay the direct and indirect taxes of all kinds, by no means signifies (as seems obvious) that the compulsory levying of money taxes for the benefit of the government and its landlord-accomplices, compels the laborers to become the slaves of those who levy the taxes; it signifies that these are: money, a means of exchange, and an iron law.

Before the serfs were emancipated, I could force Vanka to do any kind of a job; and if Vanka refused I sent him to the local judge, who whipped him till he became tractable.

At the same time, if I forced Vanka to overwork himself, if I did not give him land and food, the matter was reported to the authorities, and I had to answer the charge.

Now the people are free; but I can force Vanka and Petrushka and Sidorka to do any kind of a job for me, and if one refuses, I give him no money to pay his taxes, and they will whip him — till he submits; moreover, I can force Germans, Frenchmen, Chinese to work for me, punishing them for disobedience by withholding the money which they need to lease land or buy bread, since they have neither land nor bread; and if I force them to work without food, above their strength, if I kill them with work, nobody will say a word to me; and if, in addition, I am well read in politico-economic books, I may be firmly assured that all men are free, and that money does not conduce to slavery.

Our moujiks have long known that with the rouble it is possible to deal more painful blows than with the stick; only the political economist cannot see it.

To say to-day that money does not produce slavery is as correct as it was correct, fifty years since, to say that serfdom did not produce slavery.

The political economists say that, notwithstanding that by virtue of the possession of money one man may enslave another, money is a harmless means of exchange.

Why was it not said, half a century since, that, notwithstanding that serfdom enabled some men to tyrannize over others, serfdom was not a means of enslaving men, but a harmless means of rendering mutual services? Some contribute their rough labor, the others take upon themselves the care for the physical and mental welfare of the serfs and the organization of labor.

However, this, I think, was really maintained by some.

If this so-called science, political economy, did not busy itself with that with which all juridical sciences are concerned, — with furnishing an apology for violence, — it could not fail

to overlook the strange phenomenon that the distribution of wealth and the exploitation of some men by others are dependent upon money, and that only by means of money do some people command the labor of others nowadays, — that is, enslave them.

I repeat, a man who has money may purchase all the bread and let others starve, or make them his slaves for the sake of the bread.

And this is what occurs right before our eyes on an immense scale.

It would seem as if it was needful to search for the connection between slavery and money; but science with perfect assurance affirms that money has no connection whatever with the enslavement of men.

Science says:

"Money is merchandise like all other merchandise, and its value is measured by the cost of production; the difference being only in this, — that the merchandise has been selected as a medium of exchange, in consequence of its fitness for fixing values, accumulation of savings, and payments."

One man has manufactured shoes, another has raised grain, a third has raised sheep, and that they may conveniently make exchanges, they have introduced money, which represents a certain quantity of labor, and through this medium soles are exchanged for a leg of mutton or ten pounds of flour.

The devotees of that alleged science are very fond of picturing to themselves such a state of affairs, but the world has really never known it.

So it is with that other imaginary picture of primitive, pure, and perfect society, which old philosophers loved to draw.

But such a condition never existed.

In all human societies in which money, as money, existed, there invariably was oppression of the weak and unarmed by the strong and armed; and where there has been compulsion, money — tokens of value, whether cattle, furs, hides, or metals — inevitably lost this attribute of measuring values and became simply a means of delivery from compulsion.

Doubtless money has those harmless properties which science enumerates; but it has them

in reality only in such a society as is free from tyranny of one man over another, — in an ideal society; but in such a society money, as a general measure of values, would not exist at all, there having been no money in any of those societies that were not subjected to governmental tyranny.

In all communities known to us, on the other hand, that have money, it acquires the significance of a medium of exchange only because it serves as the means of tyranny; and its main function is not the serving as a medium of exchange, but the serving as a means of compulsion.

Where violence reigns, money cannot serve as a correct medium of exchange, since it cannot be a measure of value.

And it cannot be a measure of value because there can be no measure in a community in which one man is enabled to deprive another of the product of his labor.

If horses and cows raised by their owners are brought to market where they have to compete with horses and cows stolen from their owners

and sold by the robbers, it is evident that the price of horses and cows in that market will not be determined by the labor expended in raising the animals; and the prices of all other merchandise will undergo a change corresponding to that in the price of horses and cows; and money will no longer determine the value of these wares. Besides, if it is possible to acquire by force a horse, a cow, or a house, it is equally possible to acquire money in the same way, and all other things with the money so acquired. Now if money itself is acquired by force and expended in the purchase of commodities, then it totally ceases to have even the semblance of a medium of exchange.

The highwayman who, having committed robbery, buys with the money labor products, does not make any exchange; he simply gets what he wants by means of the money.

Even if there existed that imaginary, impossible society in which, in the absence of governmental compulsion, money — silver or gold — served as a measure of value and medium of exchange, this function of money would totally

disappear as soon as violence made its appearance.

An aggressor introduces himself into a society in the form of a conqueror. The aggressor, we will suppose, seizes cows, horses, clothing, and the houses of the inhabitants, but it is inconvenient for him to retain these things in his possession, and it naturally occurs to him to rob the people of that which represents among them every kind of value and is exchangeable for any product, — money. And straightway the function of money as a measure of value ceases to exist in that society, because the measure of value of commodities will always depend on the arbitrary conduct of the aggressor.

That commodity which the aggressor will need most and for which he will give the most money will acquire a high value, and conversely.

So, then, in a community subjected to violence money at once acquires the means of aggression in the hands of the aggressor, retaining its significance as a medium of exchange for the

invaded only to the extent, and in the respect, which may be convenient for the aggressor.

Let us contemplate the matter in a small circle.

The serfs furnish to the landed proprietor linen, hens, sheep, and daily labor. Then the landlord substitutes a money tax for the produce and fixes the prices of the products. He who has no linen, hens, sheep, and who can spare no labor power, may pay a certain sum of money.

It is evident that among the serfs of this landlord the price of the products will always depend on the fiat of the latter. The proprietor uses the products gathered, and some he wants more, some less, and according to this he fixes the prices of the goods lower or higher.

It is further evident that the fiat or necessity of the proprietor will fix the prices of the products even in so far as they are distributed among the subjects themselves.

If the proprietor wants bread, he will fix a high money tax for the privilege of paying him in other things, while those who cannot fur-

nish those things which he does not want, — linen, cattle, personal services, — will have to pay little. Therefore those who have no bread to give will sell their labor or their linen and cattle, in order to buy bread for the proprietor.

If the proprietor decides to substitute a money tax for all payments, the price of products, again, will not depend on the quantity of labor they embody, but, first, on the quantity of money demanded by the proprietor, and, secondly, on the kind of the peasants' products which he wants most and for which consequently he pays more money.

The levying of a money tax by the proprietor would fail to affect the prices of products among the peasants only if, in the first place, the peasants lived apart from other people and had no other relations than with their proprietor and with one another, and, in the second place, if the proprietor used the money for the purchase of goods outside of his village, not inside. Only under these two conditions would the value of commodities, though nominally changing, remain relatively normal, and money

perform the function of a measure of value and medium of exchange; but if the peasants have economic relations with their neighbors, then, in the first place, the greater or smaller demand for money by the proprietor will determine the higher or lower value of their products in their dealings with the neighbors. If less money is demanded from their neighbors than from themselves, then their products will sell at lower prices than those of the neighbors; and conversely.

Again, the levying of a money tax by the proprietor would not affect the values of his peasants' products, if with the money collected by him he does not buy in his own village. If he does, then, obviously, the relations between the prices of the wares in the mutual dealing of the peasants will constantly change, the changes being determined by his demand for this or that product.

Suppose that one proprietor has imposed upon his peasants a very high tax, while a low one has been imposed by his neighbor; manifestly, in the estate of the former all products

will be cheaper than on the estate of the latter, and the prices in either estate will depend on the increase or decrease of the tax.

Such is one effect of force on prices.

Another effect, flowing from the first, will be exhibited in the relative values of the products.

Suppose that one proprietor is fond of horses, and pays high prices for them, while another likes certain handkerchiefs, and buys them at high prices. Manifestly, on the estates of these proprietors horses and handkerchiefs will be dear, and the prices of these will not be normally related to the prices of cows and bread. To-morrow the lover of handkerchiefs dies, his heir being a lover of hens, and the price of handkerchiefs falls, while that of hens rises.

In every society where oppression of man by man exists, the function of money as a measure of values at once becomes dependent on the fiat of the aggressor, and its function as a medium of exchange is superseded by another function, — that of serving as the most convenient means of profiting by the labor of others.

The oppressor does not need the money for

purposes of exchange, or to fix upon a measure of values, — he regulates value himself, — but simply as a convenient weapon of oppression, since money is easily preserved and enables one to hold in subjection the largest number of people.

To take away all the cattle, in order to have always on hand as many cows, sheep, horses, as may be needed, is inconvenient, because they have to be fed and cared for; similarly, grain gets spoiled; and so with labor: sometimes a thousand workers are needed, sometimes none.

Money, when demanded from those who have not any, delivers one from all these inconveniences, and enables the aggressor to have always what he needs, which is all that he cares about.

Besides, the aggressor also needs money in order to extend his right of profiting by another's labor over all who are in want of money, and not limited to a certain number of people.

When there was no money, each proprietor could only utilize the labor of his own peasants; but when two have agreed to have the payments made in money, which the peasants did

not possess, each of them could use indiscriminately any and all the forces on the two estates.

Hence the oppressor finds it more convenient to demand money payment from all whose labor he claims, and he only wants the money for its virtue to command labor.

As to the oppressed, to him who is robbed of his labor, he does not need any money, either for exchange — since he can exchange without money, as all the people without governments have exchanged — or for fixing the measure of values — since this is fixed without his intervention — or for saving — since he who is robbed of the products of his labor cannot save — or for payments, since the oppressed always gives more than he receives, and even when he gets anything, he is given goods rather than money, as the laborers who get the equivalent of their wages in articles from their master's store, or even as those who exchange their wages for the necessaries of life in "free" stores.

He is commanded to give money, and is told that, if he does not pay, he will not be given land, bread, or that his cow, his house will be

taken away, and he will be put to work or imprisoned. He can escape this only by selling the products of his labor, his labor-power, or the labor of his children. But these products, or his labor, he is obliged to sell at the rates fixed, not by normal exchange, but by that power which demands the tribute from him.

And under these influences of tribute or taxes upon values, always and everywhere present, — among landed proprietors and their peasants, on a small scale; in governments, on a large scale, — under these conditions, which make the causes of the fluctuations of values as plain as the cause of the movement of dancing dolls to him who stands behind the scenes, — under these conditions, to speak of money as merely a medium of exchange and measure of values, is, to say the least, wonderful!

Every kind of oppression of man by man rests on the possibility which a man has of taking another's life and, by keeping a threatening attitude, compelling his obedience.

One may assert without fear of being in error

that, wherever there is subjection of man, — that is, the doing by one, against his will, in accordance with another's wishes, certain personally undesired acts, — the cause of it is force having for its basis the threat of taking life.

Where a man surrenders the whole of his labor to another, goes without sufficient nourishment, consigns his little children to hard labor, and devotes his whole life to repugnant and (to him) useless labor, — as is done before our own eyes in our own world (called civilized by us because we live in it), — it may with certainty be said that he does all this because, for non-fulfilment, he is threatened with the loss of life.

Therefore, in our cultured world, where the majority of men, under terrible privations, perform hateful and (to them) useless labor, — the majority of men are in a state of slavery, founded on the threat of loss of life.

In what, then, does this slavery manifest itself, and how is the threat expressed?

In ancient times the method of enslavement and the threat of taking life were plain enough: the primitive method of enslaving men consisted of the direct threat of death by the sword.

The armed said to the unarmed:

"I can kill you, as you saw I did with your brother; but I do not wish to do it; I will spare you, primarily because both for me and for you it will be more profitable if you will consent to work for me instead of being killed. So do everything I command you; if you refuse, I kill you."

And the unarmed surrendered to the armed and did all that he commanded.

The unarmed worked, the armed threatened.

This was that personal slavery which early appears among all nations and which is now still to be met with among savage nations.

This method of enslaving men is the first to come into vogue, but as life grows complex, this method is modified. Under complex conditions of life this method presents great inconveniences for the oppressor. In order to profit by the labor of the weak, the oppressor must feed and clothe them, — that is, take such care of them as might make them fit for work, — and this limits the number of the enslaved; moreover, this method forces the oppressor to

perpetually guard the enslaved in a threatening attitude.

And so a new form of subjection is evolved.

Five thousand years since, as the Bible tells us, was invented, by Joseph the handsome, that more convenient and general method of enslaving men.

The method is the same which is to-day employed in taming horses and wild animals in menageries.

The method is — hunger.

Here is the Biblical description of this invention.

Gen., Chap. 41, v. 48: "And he gathered up all the food of the seven years, which were in the land of Egypt, and laid up the food in the cities: the food of the field, which was round about every city, laid he up in the same.

"49. And Joseph gathered corn as the sand of the sea, very much, until he left numbering; for it was without number. . . .

"53. And the seven years of plenteousness, that was in the land of Egypt, were ended.

"54. And the seven years of dearth began

to come, according as Joseph had said: and the dearth was in all lands; but in all the land of Egypt there was bread.

"55. And when all the land of Egypt was famished, the people cried to Pharaoh for bread: and Pharaoh said unto all the Egyptians, Go unto Joseph; what he saith to you, do.

"56. And the famine was over all the face of the earth: and Joseph opened all the storehouses, and sold unto the Egyptians; and the famine waxed sore in the land of Egypt.

"57. And all countries came into Egypt to Joseph for to buy corn; because that the famine was so sore in all lands."

Joseph, enjoying the right of the original method of enslaving men by the threat of the sword, gathered grain in the years of plenty, anticipating bad years, which generally follow the good, — as all people know even without Pharaoh's dream, — and by this means, by hunger, he enslaved in the surest and most convenient way for Pharaoh the Egyptians as well as the inhabitants of neighboring countries. As soon as the people began to feel

hunger, he manipulated matters so as to permanently enslave the people by means of hunger.

In the 47th chapter this is described as follows:

"13. And there was no bread in all the land; for the famine was very sore, so that the land of Egypt and all the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine.

"14. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought: and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house.

"15. And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph, and said: Give us bread; for why should we die in thy presence? for the money faileth.

"16. And Joseph said, Give your cattle, and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail.

"17. And they brought their cattle unto Joseph: and Joseph gave them bread in ex-

change for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the acres; and he fed them with bread for all their cattle for that year.

"18. When that year was ended, they came unto him the second year, and said unto him, We will not hide it from my lord, how that our money is spent; my lord also hath our herds of cattle; there is not aught left in the sight of my lord, but our bodies and our lands.

"19. Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our land? buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh: and give us seed that we may live and not die, that the land be not desolate.

"20. And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh's.

"21. And as for the people, he removed them to cities from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof.

"22. Only the land of the priests bought he not; for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them: wherefore they sold not their lands.

"23. Then Joseph said unto the people, Behold, I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh: lo, here is seed for you, and ye shall sow the land.

"24. And it shall come to pass in the increase, that ye shall give the fifth part unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones.

"25. And they say: Thou hast saved our lives: let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh's servants.

"26. And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, that Pharaoh should have the fifth part; except the land of the priests only, which became not Pharaoh's."

Formerly, in order to profit by the labor of men, Pharaoh had to force them to work for

him. Now, having the land and the stored-up grain, he has only to watch the store-houses, and hunger will compel them to work for him. The land is all his, and the stored-up food (the part taken from the people) is his; instead of driving each person singly to work by the sword, he only needs to guard the stores to make the people his slaves — not by the sword, but by hunger. In a year of famine all may be caused to die of starvation by Pharaoh, and in better season all those may be caused to die of starvation whom accidental misfortunes prevent from gathering their own store.

Thus is fixed the second method of enslaving men, not by the sword, that is, by the strong driving, under threat of inflicting death, the weak to work, but by the stronger gathering up all the products and guarding them, thus compelling the weaker to sell himself for bread.

Joseph says to the hungry:

"I can cause you to die of starvation, since I have all the grain, but I spare you on condition that, for the bread I give you, you will do all that I order you."

For the first method of subjugation, the stronger needs warriors only, to constantly go about among the inhabitants and, under threats of death, force them to execute the stronger's will. In the first form, the ruler has to divide only with his warriors. Under the second method, he needs, besides warriors to guard the land and stores, another kind of assistants, great and small Josephs, managers and distributers of the grain. The ruler has to divide with these also, and give Joseph fine clothes, a gold ring, servants, food, and silver to his brothers and relatives. Furthermore, from the nature of things, not alone the managers and their relatives, but all private possessors of stores, become shareholders of power under the second method.

As in the first form, founded on brute force, every man having weapons becomes a partner in the aggression, so in the second form, founded on hunger, every one having a store shares in the aggression and becomes a ruler.

The superiority of this method over the first, from the point of view of the aggressor, chiefly

consists in the circumstance that he is no longer obliged to exert himself to compel the laborers' obedience, and that the laborers come voluntarily and sell themselves to him; and, in the second place, it is superior because a smaller number of people are able to escape from his oppression.

The disadvantage of it for the oppressor lies in the necessity to divide with a larger number of men.

The advantage of this form for the oppressed is in the circumstance that they are no longer subjected to brutal violence, and that they conceive, and always may hope for, a possibility of becoming under fortunate circumstances oppressors in their turn.

This new method of subjugation generally comes into vogue together with the old one, and the ruler limits or extends one or the other according to the needs of the occasion.

But this method, too, fails to completely satisfy the stronger's wish to take away the largest possible quantity of products from the largest possible number of laborers and to en-

slave the largest possible number of men; and it also fails to correspond to the greater complexity of the conditions of life; and still another method is evolved.

This new and third method is that of taxation.

Like the second, it is based on hunger, but to the method of enslaving men by depriving them of bread is added the taking away of other necessaries. The stronger fixes the tribute at such a quantity of money-tokens, which are in his own possession all the while, as makes it necessary to sell, in order to obtain them, not only more than the fifth part of their grain which Joseph demanded, but other things of prime necessity, such as meat, hides, wool, textures, coal, and even buildings; and thus the aggressor holds them always in subjection, not only through the fear of hunger, but through the fear of cold, and all other kinds of privations.

So the third form of slavery is fixed, under which the strong says to the weak:

"I can do with each of you whatever I please; I can kill you by taking away the land

which feeds you; I can, with the money-tokens which you are obliged to furnish me, buy all the bread which you consume and sell it to strangers, and cause you to starve; I can take away everything you possess, the cattle, the houses, the clothing. But this is inconvenient and unpleasant to me, and therefore I shall allow you to dispose of your labor and products as you like; you shall only have to pay me so many money-tokens, which I shall fix either in the form of a poll-tax, or in the form of a land-tax, or a tax in proportion to the quantity of things you consume, or one on clothing, or on buildings. Give me these tokens, and you may arrange your mutual dealings as you please; but know that I shall not defend or protect widows, orphans, sick, aged, or victims of accident; I shall only maintain the proper circulation of these money-tokens. Him will I defend, and he will be right in my eyes, who shall accurately give me the stipulated quantity of these tokens. How they are acquired, — is a matter which does not concern me."

And the strong pays out these tokens exclusively in the shape of receipts certifying the fulfilment of his exactions.

The second form of subjugation consisted in this: — that Pharaoh, having taken the fifth part of the crop and storing up the grain, could, in addition to his power of personally enslaving men by his sword, exercise, together with his assistants, authority over the laborers in bad seasons and over some of them in times of accidental misfortune.

The third form consists in this: — that Pharaoh demands of the laborers more money than the fifth part of the grain formerly taken costs, and he and his accomplices get a new means of ruling over the laborers, not merely in time of famine and accidental misfortunes, but at all times.

Under the second form enough grain is left to the laborers to enable them to endure small failures of crops and occasional misfortunes; under the third, when the demand is larger, all the grain is taken away and all other necessaries accumulated, and; at the least failure, the

laborer, having neither grain nor other products that he could exchange for grain, makes himself the slave of him who has money.

For the first form the ruler only needs warriors, with whom he divides; for the second, he must have, besides guardians of the land and the grain-stores, collectors and distributers; under the third form, he cannot any longer own all the lands, but must have, besides warriors to guard the land and the wealth, landowners and tax-collectors, as well as tax-assessors and supervisors, customs officials, coin-makers, and treasury officials.

The organization of the third system is much more complex than that of the second; under the second, the gathering of products may be rented out, as was done in ancient times and as is done to-day in Turkey. While the imposition of money-taxes requires a complicated administrative body to see that the people or the taxed activities do not evade the taxes. Hence, under the third form, the ruler must divide with a still larger number than under the second. Besides, from the nature of things,

under this form all who possess money, whether belonging to his own or another country, participate in the exploitation.

The advantage of this form over the first and second are as follows:

In the first place, under it a greater quantity of products may be taken and in a more convenient way, since a money-tax is like a screw and may be turned down to the last point at which the hen which lays the golden eggs can subsist; and it is not necessary to wait for a bad year, as under Joseph, since the bad year is made everlasting.

In the next place, under this form, the oppression is extended over all who formerly escaped, who, being landless, gave only a part of their labor for grain, and who are now obliged, in addition to that part, to give another part of their labor in taxes.

The disadvantage of the form for the oppressor is in the necessity to divide with a large number of people, — not only with his immediate assistants, but with all those private proprietors who usually appear under that form, as

well as with all those men, native and foreign, who possess the money-tokens demanded of the laborer.

For the oppressed, this system is in one respect more advantageous than the second: he is allowed a still larger amount of personal independence; he can live where he pleases; do what he pleases; he can sow or not, as he likes; he is not obliged to render any account of his work, and, if he has money, he can regard himself as perfectly free and always hope to attain, at least for a time, provided he gets an extra quantity of money or land, not only the position of an independent man, but of an oppressor of others.

His disadvantage lies in the fact that, on the whole, under the third form, the condition of the oppressed is a much more difficult one, and he is deprived of a greater part of his products, since the number of men exploiting the labor of others increases under it, and the burden of their maintenance falls upon a smaller number.

This third form of oppression is also very old and comes into vogue together with the first two, not entirely excluding them.

These three methods of enslaving men have never ceased to exist.

They may all be compared to screws which press down the board placed upon the laborers.

The principal, central screw, without which the others would not work at all, — the screw which is driven in wholly and never loosened, is that of personal slavery, — the enslavement of men by others by means of threats of death by the sword.

The second screw, which is turned in after the first, is the enslavement of men through the alienation of land and stores of products, the alienation being effected by the threat of death.

While the third screw is the enslavement of men through the demand of money-tokens which they lack, also effected by the threat of loss of life.

All the screws are turned in, and only when one is made firmer is another loosened a little.

For the complete enslavement of the laborer, the three screws, the three methods, are all indispensable; and in our society the three methods are always in use, the three screws are always in operation.

The first method of enslaving men by personal violence and the threat of death by the sword has never been dispensed with and will not cease to be resorted to as long as any kind of enslavement of man by man remains, since upon it rests every kind of slavery.

We are all innocently persuaded that personal slavery is abolished in our civilized society, that its last vestiges are totally effaced in America and Russia, and that to-day only the barbarians retain slavery.

We lose sight of one trifling circumstance — of the existence of hundreds of millions of soldiers in the standing armies without which not a single government is found, and with the disappearance of which would collapse the whole economic fabric of every government.

What, then, are these millions of soldiers, if not the personal slaves of those that rule over them?

Are not these men forced to fulfil the wishes of their masters under threat of torture and death, — threats so often carried into execution? The only difference is that the subjection of

these slaves is called, not slavery, but discipline, and that, whereas the slaves were slaves from birth to death, these are slaves during a more or less limited period called the period of their service.

Not only is personal slavery not abolished in our civilized societies, but, with the introduction of general military service, it has been strengthened of late. It remains as it has ever been, only slightly modified.

And it cannot but remain; for, as long as there will be enslavement of man by man, this personal slavery will exist, this slavery which, by the threat of the sword, maintains the enslavement by means of land monopoly and taxes.

But is not, perhaps, the army needed, as it is said, for the defence and glory of the fatherland?

Well, this usefulness of the army is more than questionable, since we see how frequently, after unsuccessful wars, it serves to enslave and dishonor the fatherland; while its usefulness is entirely unquestionable in the matter of up-

holding slavery through land monopoly and taxes.

Let the Irish or Russian peasants secure possession of the lands of the proprietors, and the soldiers will come and dispossess them again.

Let a distillery or brewery be erected and excise duties fail to be paid, and the soldiers will come and shut it up.

Let them refuse to pay taxes, and the same will occur.

The second screw is the enslavement of men by means of taking away their land, that is, their food.

This method of enslavement has also always existed wherever men have been held in subjection; and no matter what changes of form it undergoes, it exists everywhere.

In some cases the land all belongs to the emperor, as in Turkey, while the tenth part of the crops is appropriated by the crown; in some cases only a portion of the land is thus owned and the taxes are collected from its products; in some cases, all the land belongs to a small number of persons and taxes are paid for its

use, as in England; in some cases, a larger or smaller part belongs to large proprietors, as in Russia, Germany, and France.

But where slavery exists there goes with it the appropriation of the land by the enslaver.

The screw of this form of slavery is tightened or loosened according to the degree of tightness in which the other screws are held. Thus, in Russia, when the personal slavery was extended over the majority of laborers, the slavery by land monopoly was a superfluity; and the screw of personal slavery was loosened in Russia only when the land and taxation screws had been tightened. They had arbitrarily made all members of respective communities, made emigration difficult, and had appropriated the land or divided it among private individuals, and then they—*gave the peasants freedom!*

In England, for example, enslavement through land monopoly is the predominating form, and the issue of the naturalization of land means simply that the screw of taxation is to be tightened and the land-slavery screw loosened.

The third method of enslavement by means of taxes, tribute, has also always existed; and in our time, with the extension of similar money-tokens in different governments and the strengthening of governmental authority, it has become peculiarly strong: it has in fact so developed that it ever tends to supplant the second method, that of land slavery.

We have, in Russia, within our own recollection, passed through two changes in the form of slavery. When the serfs were liberated and the proprietors left in possession of a large part of the land, the latter feared that their power over the former would vanish; but, as experience has now shown, they simply had to let go the old chain of personal slavery, and take hold of another, — the land-monopoly chain. The peasant lacked bread to feed himself, while the proprietor had the land and the stores of products; hence the peasant remained the same slave. The next transformation was when the government tightened the screw of taxation and the majority of laborers were compelled to sell themselves to the proprietors and manu-

facturers. This new form is holding the people still tighter, so that nine-tenths of the Russian laboring population work for the landed proprietors and manufacturers because they are driven to it by the demand of the government for land and other taxes. This is so obvious that, were the government to refrain for one year from demanding direct, indirect, and land taxes, all the work on the landlord's fields and in the factories would stop entirely. Nine-tenths of the Russian people hire themselves out at the time taxes are wanted and solely on account of the taxes.

The three methods of enslaving men have always existed and exist to-day; but people are apt to overlook them the moment a new excuse for them is provided; and, the strangest thing of all is that just that method upon which to-day everything is rested, which sustains all, — is not noticed at all.

When in the ancient world the entire economic fabric rested on personal slavery, the greatest minds could not see it.

To Xenophon, and Plato, and Aristotle, and

the Romans it seemed that things could not be different, and that slavery was the inevitable and natural result of wars, without which, in turn, humanity was inconceivable.

Similarly, in the Middle Ages, and until very recently, people could not perceive the significance of landed property and the slavery consequent upon it, which upheld the entire economic structure of the Middle Ages. And even so, to-day, nobody sees, or wishes to see, that in our time the enslavement of the majority of men is based on the money-taxes, levied upon land and otherwise, which are collected by government from the subjects, — taxes collected by the administration and the army, the very administration and army which subsist upon these taxes.

It is not surprising that the slaves themselves, under subjection from the most ancient times, are not aware of the nature of their condition, and regard that condition of slavery in which they have always lived as the natural condition of human life, seeing an improvement in mere changes of the form of slavery.

Nor is it surprising that the slaveholders, sometimes honestly, think that they are emancipating the slave when they loosen one screw when another had been tightened.

Both the first and the second have become accustomed to their condition; and the slaves, not knowing freedom, seek relief in mere changes in the form of slavery, while the slaveholders, desiring to veil their wrong, endeavor to ascribe special significance to those new forms of slavery which they substitute for the old.

But what *is* surprising is that science, the so-called science, in investigating the economic conditions of the life of nations, can fail to see that which forms the basis of their economic conditions.

It would seem that the business of science were to find the connection between phenomena, and the general course of a series of phenomena. Political economy does exactly the opposite of this: it carefully conceals the connection between phenomena and their significance, and carefully avoids answers to the simplest and

most fundamental questions. Like a lazy, restive horse, it goes straight when descending a hill and having nothing to carry; when there is any load to carry, it at once becomes stubborn, and refuses to go straight. As soon as the science is confronted with a serious, essential question, it at once launches into the most learned discourses upon matters altogether irrelevant, which can only have one purpose, — the diverting of attention from the question.

You ask:

What is the course of that unnatural, monstrous, unwise, and useless — nay, injurious — fact that some people cannot eat or work otherwise than as others wish them to?

And science, with the most serious air, replies:

The cause is that some men control the labor and nourishment of others, — such being the law of production.

You ask:

What is this right of property, under which certain men appropriate the land, food, and implements of others?

Science, with the most serious air, answers:

This right is based on protection of one's labor, — that is, the protection of the labor of some is manifested in the seizure of the labor of others.

You ask, what that money is which government or power everywhere coins and prints, and which, in such immense quantities, is forcibly collected from the laborers and levied on future generations under the shape of government debts? You ask, whether this money, extorted in the shape of taxes and fixed at the extremest limits of the possibility of collection, whether this money has any effect on the economic relations of men, the relations between the payers and the receivers?

And science, with a most serious air, answers:

Money is merchandise, like sugar and calico, differing from other merchandise in this only, — that it is more convenient for exchanges. Taxes have no influence whatever on the economic conditions of the nation. The laws of production, exchange, and distribution of wealth, are one thing; taxation is another thing.

You ask, whether the fact that the government can, at will, increase taxes and consign all the landless to slavery has no influence on economic conditions?

Science, with the most serious countenance, answers:

None whatever. The laws of production, exchange, distribution — are one science, while taxation and government economy are another science, the science of financial equity.

Finally you inquire about the fact that the whole people is enslaved to the government, that the government can at will ruin everybody, depriving all men of the products of their labor and even tearing them away from their tasks and putting them into military slavery. You ask if this circumstance has any influence on the economic conditions.

To this science does not even make answer.

This is an entirely different matter, this is — the science of government.

Science analyzes in the most sober manner the laws of economic life of nations, all the functions and activities of which depend on

the will of the tyrant, recognizing this influence of the tyrant as a natural condition of life. Science does exactly what an investigator of the economic conditions of personal slaves should do if he were to ignore the influence of the master's will upon the life of the slaves, — the will of him who arbitrarily makes these slaves to do this or that work, arbitrarily drives them from place to place, arbitrarily feeds them or leaves them unfed, arbitrarily kills them or lets them live.

One is fain to believe that science does this out of foolishness; but one has only to look deeper and examine the condition of the science to become persuaded that the result is not brought about by foolishness, but by great intelligence.

Science has a definite purpose, which it accomplishes.

The purpose is — to maintain the superstitions and delusions of the people and thereby hinder humanity in its advance toward truth and welfare.

There has long existed and still exists a

terrible superstition, which has done men more harm, perhaps, than the most awful religious superstitions, and it is this superstition which with all its might and perseverance the so-called science upholds.

The superstition is similar in every respect to religious superstitions. It consists in the affirmation that, besides the duties of man to man, there are still more important obligations to an imaginary being. In theology the imaginary being is — God, and in political sciences the imaginary being is — Government.

The religious superstition consists in the belief that the sacrifices, often of human lives, made to the imaginary being are essential, and that men may and should be brought to that state of mind by all methods, not excluding violence.

The political superstition consists in the belief that, besides the duties of man to man, there are more important duties to the imaginary being — Government, and that the sacrifices — often of human lives — made to the imaginary being are also essential, and that

men may and should be brought to that state of mind by all possible means, not excluding violence.

This superstition it is, formerly maintained by the priests of various religions, which the so-called science now maintains.

Men are subjected to the most terrible and worst kind of slavery; but science endeavors to assure them that it is all necessary and cannot be different.

Government must exist for the good of the people and to execute its affairs, — to rule the people and defend it from enemies. To do this, government needs money and an army. Money should be provided by all the citizens of the government, and hence all the relations of men must be considered in their relation to the necessary conditions of governmentalism.

I want to help my father in his household economy, says a plain, unlearned man, I wish to marry, and they take me and send me to Kazan for six years in the capacity of a soldier.

I serve out my soldier's term, and wish to

till the land and feed my family, but for a hundred versts around I am not allowed to sow without paying money that I have not got to those people who cannot sow, and they want so much money that I must give all my labor to them; still, I manage to save something and wish to give the whole of this to my children, but the district police official comes and takes it away as taxes; again I earn something, and again everything is taken away. My whole economic activity, without any exempted portion, is at the disposal of the government, and I fancy that the improvement of my condition and that of my brothers must come from our emancipation from governmental claims.

But science says:

Your notions spring from your ignorance. Study the laws of production, exchange, and distribution of wealth, and do not confound questions economical with questions of government. The facts to which you point are not restraints upon your freedom, but are those needful sacrifices which you in common with others make for your freedom and your welfare.

But they have taken my son and promise to take all my sons as soon as they become of age, again says the plain man, taken by force and driven under bayonets to a land of which we had never heard, and for purposes which we cannot understand. But the land which we are not allowed to till and from the lack of which we die of hunger is in possession of a man whom we have never seen and whose usefulness we cannot even understand. But the taxes, to pay which the police official took my cow forcibly from my children, as far as I know, will go to the same police official and various members of commissions and ministers which I do not know and in the usefulness of which I do not believe. In what way, then, can all this compulsion secure my freedom, and how will all this wrong conduce to my welfare?

It is possible to force a man to be a slave and do that which he regards as injurious to himself, but it is impossible to force him to think that, in suffering violence, he is free, and that that manifest evil which he endures constitutes his welfare.

This seems impossible?

But this is what has been done in our day, with the aid of science.

Government, — that is, armed and aggressive men, determine how much they want from those whom they invade (as the English in their relation to the Fijians); they determine how much labor they want of the slaves; determine how many assistants they need to collect the products; organize these assistants as soldiers, as landed proprietors, and as tax-collectors. And the slaves surrender their labor and at the same time think that they surrender it; not because their masters want it so, but because for their own liberty and welfare are needed services and sacrifices to the deity called Government; and that, aside from their services to the deity, they are free.

This they believe because they have been told so, formerly by religion, priests, and latterly by science, learned people.

But one needs only to cease to believe blindly what other people who call themselves priests or scientists say, to have the senselessness of these assertions made evident.

Men, oppressing others, assure them that the compulsion is necessary in the interest of the government, while the government is indispensable to the liberty and welfare of men: — according to this, the oppressors force men for their own freedom and do them wrong for their own good.

But men are rational beings and hence ought to understand wherein is their good, and to have liberty to do that.

Things, therefore, the beneficence of which is not clear to men and to the performance of which they have to be driven by force, cannot be for their good.

That can alone be a good to a rational being which his intelligence perceives as such.

If men, in consequence of passion or unwisdom, show preference for evil, then all that men who are wiser than their fellows may do is to try to persuade these to do that which is for their good.

It is possible to persuade men that their welfare will be greater if they will serve as soldiers, if they will be deprived of land, if they will

give away their labor in the shape of taxes; but until all men consider this their good and do it voluntarily, it cannot be called men's welfare. The sole indication of the beneficence of a thing is that men freely perform it.

And of such things the life of men is full.

Ten laborers organize an association to work together, and in doing this they undoubtedly do something that is for their common benefit; but it is impossible to imagine that these laborers, compelling another laborer to join them and work with them against his will, should assert that the eleventh member's interests is identical with their own.

The same applies to gentlemen giving a dinner to some friend of theirs; it cannot be affirmed that the dinner will be a good to the man forced to pay ten roubles for it.

The same with peasants who might think the existence of a pond a greater good than the labor expended on it; for them the digging would be a common benefit. But for him who should think the existence of a pond a lesser good than the getting in of his crops, in which

he was tardy, the digging of the pond could not be a benefit.

The same with roads built by men, with a church, with a museum, and with all the different social and governmental affairs.

All these affairs can be beneficial for those only who think them so and freely and voluntarily perform them, as the purchase of tools for the coöperative workshop, the dinner given by the masters, the pond dug by the peasants.

But things to which men must be driven by force, cease to be, thanks to the force, for the common good.

All this is so clear and simple that, if men had not been deceived so long, it would not be necessary to make them plain.

Suppose we are living in a village, and we inhabitants have all decided to construct a bridge over the swamp in which we get sunk. We have agreed or promised to give so much each in money, or labor, or material. We agreed to do it because it is more advantageous for us to construct the bridge than sink in the swamp. But in our midst there are men

for whom it is more advantageous to do without a bridge than to spend money on one, or who, at least, think that that is more advantageous for them. Can the forcing of these men into the enterprise make the bridge advantageous to them? Evidently not; since these men, having considered voluntary cooperation in the construction of the bridge disadvantageous for them, will all the more regard it as disadvantageous for them to be forcibly compelled to coöperate. Suppose even that we had all, without exception, agreed to build the bridge and promised so much labor and money for each holding, but that some of the parties subsequently failed to make their contribution, their circumstances having so altered in the meantime that it became more advantageous for them to do without the bridge than to spend money on it, or because they had changed their mind, or even because they had figured out that the others, without their contribution, would build the bridge anyway, and that they would use it gratuitously. Can the forcing of these men into coöperation

make the sacrifices beneficial to them? Evidently not, since if they failed to carry out their pledge because altered circumstances had made the sacrifices heavier for them than the inconvenience of not having the bridge, then the compulsory sacrifices will make the evil still greater for them. If, however, the parties intended to profit by the labor of others, then the compulsory sacrifices will be punishment for their intention, and the intention, which is utterly unproved, will be punished before it has been carried out. But neither in the first nor in the second case will the forcing of the men into coöperation be as advantageous for them.

And so it will be when the sacrifices are forced for a thing understood by everybody, a thing obviously and undoubtedly useful, such as the building of a bridge over a swamp.

How much more unjust and senseless, then, will be the compelling of millions of men to sacrifices the purpose of which is unknown to them and undoubtedly injurious, as is the case with military service and taxation.

But according to science, all that everybody regards as evil is in reality a common advantage; it turns out that there is an insignificant minority of men who alone know what the common good consists of, and despite the fact that all the rest of mankind consider the common good as evil, the minority, in forcing to evil all the rest, can consider this evil as common good.

Herein is the chief superstition and the chief delusion which hinders the progress of humanity toward truth and welfare.

The maintenance of this superstition and this delusion constitutes the end of political sciences generally and of so-called political economy in particular.

Its purpose is to conceal from the people that condition of oppression and slavery in which they live.

The method employed is this: in considering the force which conditions the whole economic life of the enslaved, it is pretended that this force is natural and inevitable, and thereby the people are deceived and their attention diverted from the real cause of their misery.

The abolition of slavery has gone on for a long time.

Rome abolished slavery, America abolished it, and we did, but only the words were abolished, not the thing.

Slavery means the freeing themselves, by some, of the necessity of labor for the satisfaction of their needs and the throwing of this labor upon others by means of physical force; and where there is a man who does not labor because another is compelled to work for him, there slavery is. And where, as in all European societies, men by force exploit the labor of thousands of men and regard it as their prerogative, while the latter submit to force and regard it as their duty, there we have slavery in terrible proportions.

Slavery exists.

Where, then, do we find it?

Where it has always been and without which it cannot be: in the compulsion exercised by the strong and armed upon the weak and unarmed.

Slavery has three fundamental methods:

direct personal violence, militarism, land-taxes, upheld by the military power, and direct and indirect taxes upon citizens, also upheld by the military power.

The three methods exist to-day as much as formerly. Only, we do not see it, because each of these three forms of slavery has received a new excuse which veils its real significance.

The personal violence of the armed upon the unarmed is justified on the ground of defence of fatherland against imaginary enemies; in reality, it has the same old function — the subjection of the conquered to the invaders.

The indirect force of the appropriation of the lands of those who work on them is justified as compensation for services to the alleged common welfare and sanctioned by the right of inheritance; in reality, it is the same land-robbery and enslavement which was once carried out by the military power.

The last, the money-taxation species of force, the most powerful and popular at the present time, has received the most wonderful justification, — namely, that the denial of liberty, prop-

erty, and every good to men is in the interest of the common liberty and welfare.

In reality it is nothing else than slavery, only impersonal.

Where force is set up as law, there will slavery be.

Whether it is princes and their warlike bands who invade, kill wives and children, and burn down the village; whether slaveholders demand money or labor from the slaves for the land, and in case of non-compliance call the armed bands to their aid; or whether the Ministry of Internal Affairs is collecting money through the governors and police officials, and, in case of non-success, sending armed regiments, — as long as there shall be tyranny supported by the bayonet there will be no distribution of wealth among men, but all the wealth will go to the tyrants.

A striking illustration of the truth of this position is afforded by George's project of nationalizing land.

George proposes to declare all land government property, and to substitute a rent-tax for

all the direct and indirect taxes. That is, every one using land should pay the government its rental value.

What would the outcome be?

Land would belong to the government: to the English, the land of England, to the Americans the land of that country, and so forth; that is, there would be slavery, determined by the quantity of land in use. Perhaps the condition of some laborers (such as agricultural) would be improved; but since there would remain the forcible collection of the tax of the rental values, there would also remain slavery. The land-cultivator, in a bad year, not being able to pay the rent exacted from him by force, would have to enslave himself to the man with money in order to keep his land and not lose everything.

If a pail leaks, there is surely a hole in it.

Looking at the pail, it may seem to us that the water comes from many holes, but no matter how much we might try to stop up the imaginary holes, from the outside, the pail would still leak.

To stop the leaking it is necessary to find the

hole through which the water comes out and stop it up from within.

It is equally the case with the means proposed to stop the inequitable distribution of wealth, — to stop up those holes through which the wealth of the nations goes out.

It is said: organize coöperations of laborers; make capital common property; make land common property.

All this is simply the stopping up from the outside of those holes through which it seems to us the water goes out.

To stop the leaking it is necessary to find, inside, that hole through which the wealth leaves the hands of the laborers and goes into the hands of the non-laborers.

That hole is the compulsion of the unarmed by the armed.

The force of the military power, by which men are taken from their labor, and land from men, and the products of men's labor.

As long as there shall be one armed man with a recognized right to kill any other man, so long will there be inequitable distribution of wealth, — that is, SLAVERY.

MAN AND WOMAN: THEIR RESPECTIVE FUNCTIONS.

Translated by George Schumm.

MAN AND WOMAN: THEIR RESPECTIVE FUNCTIONS.

THE calling of every individual, man or woman, consists in serving mankind.

I believe all cultivated persons will agree to this general principle.

The difference between man and woman in the execution of this calling lies alone in the means which they employ, — that is, by which they serve mankind.

Man serves mankind alike by physical work, the securing of food, intellectual work, the study of the laws of nature in order to dominate over her, and social work, the institution of the forms of life and the determination of the relations between man and man. The means of service are very manifold for man. With the exception of the bearing and nursing of children, all human activity constitutes the field of his services for mankind.

But woman, besides the possibility given her by her whole existence of serving mankind, like man, is by her organization inevitably called and drawn into that service which alone is excluded from the domain of the service of man.

The service of mankind resolves itself into two parts:

1. The improvement of the lot of living men and women;

2. The perpetuation of mankind itself.

To the former men are chiefly called, since the possibility of the latter service is denied them. To the second women are called, as they are exclusively capacitated therefor.

This difference must not be forgotten or obliterated; it would even be sinful (that is, erroneous). Out of this difference arise the duties alike of the one and the other, duties that have not been devised by man, but which inhere in the nature of things. Out of this difference arises the estimation of the virtues and vices alike of woman and of man, an estimation that has always existed, exists now, and will never

cease to exist as long as man is endowed with reason.

It has always been, and will ever be, that man who spends the greater part of his life at the manifold physical, intellectual, and social work peculiar to him, and woman who spends the greater part of her life at the work exclusively peculiar to her of bearing, nursing, and rearing children, will alike feel that they are engaged in their proper spheres, and will alike elicit the love and respect of other persons, for both are fulfilling their part, that for which they are predestined by their nature.

The calling of man is more many-sided and broader, that of woman more uniform and restricted, but deeper, and therefore it has always been and will ever be that man, with his hundreds of duties, will not therefore become a bad and harmful person because he has proved faithless to a tenth of them, since he still fulfils the larger part of his calling. But woman, with her limited number of duties, at once falls, in becoming faithless to one, morally below man who has proved faithless to several of his hun-

dreds of duties. Such has ever been the general opinion, and such it will ever remain, for such is the nature of things.

For the purpose of fulfilling the will of God man must serve him in the domain of physical work, of thought, and of morality; in all these ways he can fulfil his calling. For woman the means of the service of God consist principally and almost exclusively (because besides her no one else can have them) in children.

Only by his works is man called to serve God.

Only by her children is woman called to serve God.

Therefore, the love for her children which is implanted in woman — an exceptional love, against which it is quite in vain to battle with reason — will and must ever be peculiar to woman as mother. The love for the child in youth is by no means egotistical, but it is the love of the workman for his work which he accomplishes while it is in his hands. Take away from him this love for the object of his work, and the work becomes impossible. As long as I am working on a boot, I love it most.

Had I not loved it, I could not have made it. If it should be destroyed, I should despair. I love it as long as I work. When I have finished the work, there remains an attachment, a weak and unlawful preference.

Just so with the mother. Man is called to serve mankind by manifold works, and he loves these works as long as he is engaged on them. Woman is called to serve mankind by her children, as long as she cares for them, till the third, seventh, tenth year.

In the calling to serve God and mankind, man and woman are quite alike, notwithstanding the difference in the form of the service. The equality consists in the fact that the one service is as important as the other, that the one is inconceivable without the other, that the one is conditional on the other, and that for real service the knowledge of truth, without which the work of man and woman alike would not be useful, but detrimental to mankind, is as indispensable to man as to woman.

Man is called to fulfil his manifold work, but his work is useful, his service, physical, intel-

lectual, and social, is fruitful only when it is done in the name of truth and for the benefit of other people. How zealously soever man may occupy himself by increasing his pleasures by idle musings, and by social activity, his work will not be fruitful. It will be fruitful only when it is directed towards lessening the evils of mankind originating in want, ignorance, and false social institutions.

So it is with the calling of woman. The bearing, nursing, and rearing of children will be useful to mankind only when she shall bring up children not simply for her pleasure, but as future servants of mankind, when the rearing of these children shall be done in the name of truth and for the benefit of men, that is, when she shall so educate her children that they will become the best type of men and women, and workers for mankind.

According to my view, she will be the ideal woman who, after having assimilated the highest view of life of the age in which she lives, shall devote herself to her service as woman, to her inexorably appointed calling of bearing,

nursing, and educating the greatest possible number of children who will be capable of serving mankind according to the view of life imbibed from her.

But, in order to achieve the highest view of life, it is not necessary, according to my opinion, to attend courses; we need only to study the Gospels and not shut our eyes, ears, and especially the heart.

But how about those who have no children, who do not enter the married state, the widows? They will do well to take part in the manifold labors of men. But it is deplorable that such a precious instrument as woman has been deprived of the possibility of fulfilling the one great deed peculiar to her, the more so as every woman, after having borne children, if she still has strength, will assist her husband in his work. The assistance of the woman in this work is very precious.

But to see a young woman, capable of bearing children, employed at men's work, will ever be deplorable. To see such a woman is like the sight of rich loam that is covered with gravel

for a place or a promenade. It is still more deplorable, as this soil could have produced only grain, while the woman could have produced that which is priceless and than which there is nothing higher — man.

And only she alone can accomplish that.

THE MOTHER.

Translated by George Schumm.

THE MOTHER.

You must know that, in order to be a true mother, it is not sufficient that you trouble and toil in secret without receiving praise therefor, — for according to the opinion of others you are simply fulfilling your duty, — nor must you expect the gratitude of those for whom you are laboring; and, if they cause you sorrow, or even reproach you, you must bear it without a murmur.

As in the case of the first child, so in the case of the second and each succeeding one; the same cares, the same labors; and yet the true, genuine mother will feel, in spite of everything, a quiet and deep satisfaction, although she cannot expect any thanks; and when all women shall think and feel so, the power over mankind will pass to them and the salvation of the world rest in their hands.

But unfortunately the number of these true mothers is growing smaller every day. Many women allow themselves to be carried away by passion and give themselves over to men at the expense of their honor; others vie with men in the desperate struggle for social positions that must seem like chimeras to the true Christian; and still others, although they do not forget the object of their life and even fulfil their maternal duties, disavow them in spirit by regarding childless women with envy and so forego the sole reward that lies in the consciousness of having served as the instrument of God, and see only misery in what ought to constitute their happiness.

We men are so entirely engrossed by our sham existence, we have, one and all, so completely forgotten the real object of life, that we all seem to be cast in one mould. While placing the whole burden of life upon others, we are at the same time too cowardly to call ourselves by the true name that belongs to men who for their own dear ego's sake allow their fellow-men to perish in misery and want! — O, the wretches and cowards!

But among women there is a difference. There are those who embody the loftiest ideal of purity, and there are those who are prostitutes. This difference will be fully apprehended only by our descendants, but we deem it our duty to call attention to it.

Every woman — however magnificent her attire, though her cradle stood at the foot of a throne, though she had mastered all the wealth of science — who does not forego sexual association, but frustrates the possibility of becoming a mother, is a prostitute!

Every other woman, how degraded soever, but who submits to her husband with the consciousness of the possibility of becoming a mother, fulfils the highest object of life: higher than she there is no one: and if you are of these women, you will not say after you have borne two, or even after you have borne twenty, children: Enough! just as a laborer of fifty years of age does not say he has worked enough as long as he can eat and sleep and his muscles demand work.

If you are of these women, you will not

burden other mothers with the cares of nursing and educating your children, just as a laborer does not transfer his almost finished work to another for completion, since he has put his whole energy into it: the harder you labor, the richer and the happier will your existence become. If, now, you are of these women, — and fortunately for mankind there are such, — you can secure the observance of the same law of the fulfilment of the will of God that serves you as a rule of conduct in the lives of your husband, your children, and your neighbors.

If you are such a mother, you know by your own experience that only self-denying, unostentatious labor, which imperils even your own life and which taxes your strength to the utmost in order to maintain the life of another being, can yield you true satisfaction, but that it also gives you the right to make the same demands on others and to call on your husbands to likewise subject themselves to the labors of life. You will measure and appreciate the worth of man according to these aspirations, and prepare your children for the fact that similar labors are awaiting them.

A true mother, who is conscious of the will of God, will also hold her children to the fulfilment of this divine will. To such a true mother it is torture to see her child overfed, pampered, and dressed up, because she knows that all this will aggravate the fulfilment of the will of God on the part of the child which she has revealed unto him; nor will she teach that which will enable the boy and the girl to escape the troubles and cares of life, but that which will make them strong to bear the troubles and cares of life. Nor does she need to ask herself, what shall I teach, what shall I prepare my children to expect; she knows what man is destined for, and therefore she also knows what she has to teach and what she has to prepare her children to expect. Such a woman will not only not support her husband in the fraudulent and false endeavor of exploiting the labor of others, but look upon such conduct with contempt and horror, since it acts as a twofold temptation to her children. Such a mother will not consider white hands and fine manners in the choice of a husband for her daughter, and since she

knows what is true conduct and what is fraud, she will always and in every instance, not excepting her husband, prize only that true labor which may even exact our own life and despise that false and pompous labor whose end is simply to escape all true and honest labor.

The women who renounce the life purpose of their sex and yet raise the claim of their rights need not say that such a point of view is impossible for a mother, that a mother is too much bound up with her children by love to deny them dainties, pleasures, and dress; nor need they trouble themselves about the future of the children if the husband is without wealth or a permanent position, fret about the future of the daughters who marry or the sons who do not get an education.

All this is only a lie and a sham.

A true mother will think differently.

You say you cannot resist the wish to give the child sweetmeats or playthings or to take him to the circus? But why do you not then give him poisonous berries, or let him ride alone in a boat, or take him to a *café chan-*

tant? Why can you forbear doing the latter, but not the former?

Because you are untruthful.

You say that you love your children too much, that you are concerned about their life, you fear they might suffer hunger and cold, and that for these reasons you respect the means and ways employed by the husband in the pursuit of the business which you yourselves admit to be unjust. You are in fear of future misfortune, perhaps poverty of your children — in the distant future and doubtful — and therefore confirm your husband in what you yourselves have recognized as unjust. But what are you doing meanwhile to protect your children against misfortune? How much time do you devote to them during the day? It is indeed much if you give them one-tenth of your time. The rest of the time they are in strange hands, in the hands of hirelings, often of persons whom you have taken from the street, or certain institutions, and who can ruin your children in body and soul. Your children must eat, consequently they are given

nourishment. Who prepares the meals, and what is furnished them, you do not know. Who instructs them in morality? That also you do not know. Therefore also do not say that you suffer evil for the love of your children: it is not true!

You do evil because you love it!

A true mother who sees in the birth and education of her children her unselfish life purpose and the fulfilment of the will of God will think and act differently. She does not think and act so, because she knows that her duty does not consist in making of her children whatever is agreeable to her or the dominant tendency; she knows that her children, that is, her descendants, are the highest and holiest that there is in reality for man, and that it is the purpose of her life to serve this highest and holiest with all her powers.

She knows that she is incessantly hovering between life and death when she is bearing a scarcely budding life to maturity in her womb, but that life and death are not her concern; but that it is her concern to serve this life;

and this service she will not seek in round-about ways, but she will go straight towards her aim.

Such a true mother gives birth to and nurses the child herself, prepares food and drink for him, washes him, instructs him, sleeps and talks with him, because she sees therein her life purpose. Only such a mother will not look for an external provision for her children in the money of her husband or in diplomas granted by the government; she will simply and solely strive towards making them skilful to fulfil the will of God, strong to bear trouble and labor, even if at the peril of life, since she will regard that as the sole happiness of life. Such a mother will not ask others for advice; she herself knows all and fears nothing.

If in the case of a man or of a childless woman doubts may arise concerning the course which they must pursue in order to fulfil the will of God, this course is clearly laid down in the case of a mother; and if she pursues this course honestly, she will attain to the summit of happiness to which only a human

being can attain, and thus become a luminous guide to the men and women who are striving to reach it. Only such a mother can calmly say under the shadow of death to Him who created her and whom she served by the bearing and rearing of her most dearly beloved children: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." . . .

This, however, is the highest perfection towards which mankind is aspiring as to the highest happiness of life.

Yes, such women who fulfil their calling rule over the ruling men; such women prepare a new posterity and guide public opinion, and therefore such women hold within their hands the highest power for the redemption of mankind from the existing and impending evils of our time.

Yes, you women who are mothers, in your hands above all rests the salvation of the world.

A SECOND SUPPLEMENT TO THE KREUTZER SONATA.

Translated by George Schumm.

A SECOND SUPPLEMENT TO THE KREUTZER SONATA.

WHAT above all I have to say in regard to marital relations is that, when I am treating of how married people ought to live, I do not only not mean to be understood as saying that I myself have been and am still living as we ought to live; but that on the contrary I know so well how we ought to live because I myself have been living as we ought not to live.

I will not retract anything of what I have said; on the contrary, I would only fully reiterate all I have said; but it is nevertheless necessary to explain myself more exactly. It is necessary because we have so far strayed from what our life ought to be according to our conscience and the teaching of Christ that the truth strikes us as painfully — as I know by my own experience — as it would strike a

prosperous provincial merchant to be told not to accumulate any more money for his family and a new church bell, but to give away all he has, simply and solely that he may escape evil.

You ask: "Is there to be no sexual association between married people, then?" Of course *not!* I have myself already thought so, and we all know at the bottom of our heart how deeply it offends our native modesty.

I will write just as the thoughts come to me what I think about this matter.

Every individual is endowed with a powerful amorous instinct, which at once begins to assert itself when persons of different sex meet in society, and which leads to marriage. Children are the natural fruits of marriage. With the advent of pregnancy the sexual association of married people enters a stage of indifference that would interrupt all sexual relations, as is the case among animals, if man did not regard sexual association as a lawful and sanctified pleasure. This sexual indifference, still further influenced by the care for the birth and nursing

of the child, continues until the weaning of the latter, and in a good marriage — and herein consists the difference between man and beast — the amorous relations of the couple are resumed only after the weaning of the child.

How far are we still from such a state of things; and yet it is plain that it must be so, and for the following reasons:

First. When a woman is not in the child-bearing stage, — that is, during the intervals between menstruation, — sexual association is something unnatural; it is nothing more than a carnal and lewd pleasure, offensive to native modesty, as every conscientious person knows, like other repulsive, unnatural sexual aberrations, and the person who succumbs to it falls below the beast, — that is, he uses his reason for the purpose of acting contrary to the laws of reason.

Second. Everybody knows and all are agreed that sexual association debilitates and exhausts a person, debilitates him indeed in the most essentially human function, the function of thought.

"Moderation!" exclaim the defenders of the present order of things. But we cannot talk about moderation where the laws prescribed by reason are transgressed. But the evil of debauchery — for sexual association outside the free period is debauchery — in the case of a man within the limits of moderation (it is disgusting to employ this word in reference to such a subject) may not be so serious if he knows only *one* woman; but what would be moderation in the case of a man would be excess in the case of a woman in the stage of pregnancy or the period of nursing.

I believe this is the principal source of hysteria and of the nervous troubles of women, and of this evil woman ought to be delivered so that she may be one in body and in spirit with her husband, and not a servant of Satan, as she is now, but a servant of the Lord.

This ideal is far distant, but sublime, and why should we not strive to attain it?

It seems to me that marriage ought to take the following shape: the couple unite sexually under the irresistible force of the amorous in-

stinct, the woman becomes pregnant, and the two live like brother and sister, avoiding everything that might prove detrimental to the birth and the nursing of the child, and suppressing instead of arousing, as is now done, all sexual temptation.

But the man who has hitherto led a debauched life transfers his portion of moral corruption to the woman, infects her with his own sensuality, and taxes her with the unbearable burden of being at one and the same time mistress, mother, and human being, and she develops, too, into an excellent mistress, a tortured mother, and a suffering, nervous, and hysterical human being. And the man loves her as his mistress, ignores her as a mother, and hates her on account of her nervousness and hysteria which he himself has caused.

It seems to me that this is the source of all the sufferings that arise in every family.

According to my opinion the man should live with the pregnant woman like brother and sister; she bears her child in peace and sucklos him, whereby she prospers morally, and only in

the free period the couple renew for a few weeks their amorous relations, which are again followed by a period of rest.

The amorous instinct seems to me like the pressure of steam, which would cause a locomotive to explode if the pressure did not open the safety valve. The valve opens only under great pressure; otherwise it is always kept closed, and carefully closed, and it must be our aim to keep it consciously tightly closed and held down moreover by a weighted lever to the limit of pressure so that it cannot open.

In this sense I also understand the words of the Bible: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it"; that is, let every one strive not to marry, but if he has taken a wife, let him live with her like brother and sister.

But the married couple unite sexually and open the safety valve; we ourselves, however, must not open it, as we are constantly doing, because we regard sexual association as a lawful pleasure.

It is lawful only when we cannot resist it, and when it breaks through in spite of our wish

to the contrary. But how are we to limit it if we cannot resist it?

How many such questions there are, and how unanswerable they seem, and yet how simply they may be answered if we have to answer them only for ourselves and not for others. For others we only know the following order to hold. An old man indulges in sexual association with a prostitute, — that is extremely disgusting. A young man does the same, — that is less disgusting. An old man maintains intimate relations with a woman, — that is disgusting, but not so disgusting as the association of a young man with a prostitute. A young man maintains intimate relations with a woman, — that is less disgusting, but still disgusting. Such an order is quite proper for others, and we all, especially if we are innocent children and young people, know it very well. But for ourselves there is something besides this. Every pure youth and every pure maiden has the consciousness, largely clouded by false opinions, that it becomes them to preserve their purity; they have the wish, too, to preserve it, and rec-

ognize the misery and the shame which its loss under whatever condition involves. There is a voice of conscience that always speaks out plainly and clearly, and ever admonishes us, before and after, that it is sinful, that it is shameful.

All depends on insight, on the understanding.

The world thinks it is not immoral to indulge in love, no matter if it has been found moral to open the safety valve and let off the steam; but according to divine law it is only moral to lead a *true* life, to serve God in the measure of our capacities, — that is, to love our neighbor and his spirit and above all that which is nearest to us: our own wife, and to assist her to receive the truth, and not to befog her receptiveness for truth by making her a tool of our own lust, — that is, to work with steam and take every precaution that it shall not escape through the safety valve.

"But thus," you say, "the human race will become extinct."

First. As long as we do not seriously strive to have no sexual association, the safety valve will remain and there will be children.

But why lie? Are we perhaps consciously counteracting the extinction of the human race during sexual association? Or are we merely thinking of our pleasure? Out with the truth! You say the human race will become extinct! Indeed, brute man! And is that perhaps a misfortune? The antediluvian animals have become extinct, brute man also will become extinct — if we judge by the external, by space and time. Let him become extinct. I will not grieve over this biped brute any more than over the ichthyosaurus and kindred monsters — if only the true life, the love of beings that are capable of love, does not cease. And that will never cease if the human race grows less in consequence of renouncing carnal lust in obedience to love; but it will grow infinitely more intense, indeed, so intense, that the continuation of the human race will no longer be necessary for those who are living a true life.

Carnal love is therefore still necessary only to the end of evolving such beings out of the men of to-day.

THE FRUITS OF CULTURE.

A COMEDY IN FOUR ACTS.

By COUNT LEO TOLSTOÏ.

TRANSLATED BY

GEORGE SCHUMM.

In this book, published for the first time in English by Mr. Tucker, Count Tolstoï continues the war which he began in "The Kreutzer Sonata," but substitutes for the terrible weapons which he used in that onslaught the piercing shafts of ridicule and satire. The follies of the so-called "cultured" classes are exhibited in a most humorous picture of their fashions, "fads," dress, habits, morals, vices, and mental freaks, and the story hinges in particular upon the effect of the craze of Modern Spiritualism upon an aristocratic family in Russia.

Boston Herald. — "There is always an undercurrent of bitterness in what Tolstoï writes, and it is more clearly perceptible in his comedy, 'The Fruits of Culture,' than it is in his more serious writing. The scenes of the play pass in the house of a Russian noble, and its theme is the cleverness with which an artlessly artful child of the people plays upon the noble's weakness for her own benefit and that of her equals. . . . The picture seems true, and, in spite of its surface humor, very melancholy."

Price: In cloth, 50 cents; in paper, 25 cents.

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER - - - Box 3366,

BOSTON, MASS.

"A novel that has no equivalent in the literature of this century."— CHARLES MONSELET.

My Uncle Benjamin.

A HUMOROUS, SATIRICAL, AND PHILOSOPHICAL NOVEL.

By CLAUDE TILLIER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY

BENJ. R. TUCKER.

WITH A SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR'S LIFE AND WORKS BY

LUDWIG PFAU.

This novel, though it has enjoyed the honor of three translations into German, has never before been translated into English. It is one of the most delightfully witty works ever written. Almost every sentence excites a laugh. It is thoroughly realistic, but not at all repulsive. Its satirical treatment of humanity's foibles, and its jovial but profound philosophy, have won its author the title of "the modern Rabelais."

PRESS NOTICES.

Detroit News.—"The book is certainly the most remarkable work published in this country this year."

Boston Saturday Evening Gazette.—"So remarkable a book that it is surprising it should have remained so long without having been given a setting in English. . . . It is wonderfully absorbing in interest. Its humor and its pathos are equally keen."

Utica Press.—"It pricks the bubble of pretensions, lays bare the sham of title, makes mock of marriage for money, reveals the fountain of kindness, and shows the gullibility of human credulity."

Richmond Despatch.—"This book truly may be called a 'find.' It is worthy to rank with 'Tom Jones,' 'Tristram Shandy,' Goldsmith's 'Vicar,' 'Don Quixote,' and 'Pickwick' in wit, humor, satire, and philosophy. 'My Uncle Benjamin' is a classic."

Detroit Free Press.—"One of the cleverest books that has come from the American press this year. As a character study it is beyond all praise."

Boston Woman's Journal.—"This story is lively, sardonic, witty, and superficial. It will delight a certain class of readers because it is reckless, and another class because it is blasphemous."

Philadelphia Item.—"Altogether a capital piece of work."

312 LARGE PAGES.

Price: In cloth, $1.00; in paper, 50 cents.

Sent postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, - - Box 3366,

BOSTON, MASS.

"Better than I," wrote Victor Hugo to Félix Pyat, "you have proved the royalty of genius and the divinity of love."

A RIVAL OF "LES MISÉRABLES."

THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS

By FÉLIX PYAT.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY

BENJ. R. TUCKER.

This masterpiece of fiction was originally written as a play, and as such achieved the greatest success known to the French stage. Recently, and just before his death, the author elaborated his play into a novel, in which form it presents a complete panorama of the Paris of the present century.

What Great Critics think of it.

Heinrich Heine.—"The passion of Shakspere and the reason of Molière."

Alexandre Dumas (to the author).—"You have killed Frédéric Lemaitre for us. After his Father Jean in 'The Rag-picker of Paris,' he can create no other rôle."

Victoria, Queen of England (to the Actor Lemaitre, after seeing him play in the piece).—"Is there, then, such misery in the Faubourg St. Antoine?"

Frédéric Lemaitre (in reply).—"It is the Ireland of Paris."

Théophile Gautier.—"The work of a Titan."

Sainte-Beuve.—"The paragon of the democratic-republican school."

Victor Hugo.—"A fortunate drama, come late enough to represent the whole people."

---

325 LARGE PAGES.

Price: In cloth, $1.00; in paper, 50 cents.

The cloth edition contains as a frontispiece a fine portrait of the author.

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, - - Box 3366,

BOSTON, MASS.

SIXTY-SECOND THOUSAND.

The Kreutzer Sonata.

By COUNT LEO TOLSTOÏ.

PRESS NOTICES.

The Critic, New York.—"One hardly dares speak of the 'Kreutzer Sonata.' It is like a moral earthquake, shattering the very foundations on which society is built, and causing the ground to crumble beneath our feet. So daring a treatment of a daring theme has never before been attempted in literature. Nothing has ever been given to the world quite like this tremendous object-lesson projected on the canvas in colossal proportions, with every shadow deepened, every line magnified and brought into appalling relief."

Kate Field's Washington.—"Why is 'The Kreutzer Sonata' prohibited? I am at a loss to imagine, unless it be that Tolstoï has told the truth — very brutally — about a very brutal condition of things. If it be a crime to tell the truth, of course Tolstoï should be suppressed. But is it?"

Buffalo Courier.—"That singular code of morals which too many men hold, that they may indulge in shameful license, and still call themselves by the 'grand old name of gentleman,' while their sisters and sweethearts must be utterly pure in their lives and conduct, receives a stunning rebuke in this work."

Boston Transcript.—"It is probably one of the most moral books ever written. . . . As children sit spellbound, frozen to the spot, though desiring to fly, through the reading of the 'Ancient Mariner,' so this generation of ours, which has strong moral impulses, but feels, nevertheless, a weight as of death about its neck, must listen to this grim story of the great Russian novelist and prose poet, whether it likes it or not."

St. Louis Republic.—"The peculiarity and audacity of Tolstoï is that he has taken this subject out of its usual dress of secret or semi-medical advice 'for private circulation only,' and clothed it in the garb of fiction, intended for universal reading."

☞ The edition published by BENJ. R. TUCKER is the only complete and correct edition published in America.

Price: In cloth, $1.00; in paper, 50 cents.

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, - - Box 3366,

BOSTON, MASS.

What's To Be Done?

A NIHILISTIC ROMANCE.

By N. G. TCHERNYCHEWSKY.

WITH A PORTRAIT OF THE AUTHOR.

WRITTEN IN PRISON.

SUPPRESSED BY THE CZAR.

THE AUTHOR OVER TWENTY YEARS AN EXILE IN SIBERIA.

PRESS COMMENTS.

Boston Advertiser.—"To call the book the 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' of Nihilism is scarcely extravagance."

Boston Courier.—"It is perhaps the book which has most powerfully influenced the youth of Russia in their growth into Nihilism."

Providence Star.—"As a revelation of folk life it is invaluable: we have no other Russian pictures that compare with it."

---

329 LARGE PAGES.

Price: In cloth, $1.00; in paper, 35 cents.

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, - - Box 3366,

BOSTON, MASS.

A FINE IS INCURRED IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW.

4618337

OCT 17 74 H

WIDENER
BOOK DUE
SEP 3 1983